

BREPOLS LIBRARY OF CHRISTIAN SOURCES  
PATRISTIC AND MEDIEVAL TEXTS WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

The cry '*ad fontes!*' has been a constant among theologians of every variety since the mid-twentieth century. This is no simple process. Each generation needs to engage with the ancient and medieval sources afresh in a great act of cultural, intellectual, and linguistic translation. More than reproducing an historical artefact or transferring it into a new linguistic code, it requires engaging in a dialogue with the text.

One dialogical pole is to acknowledge the inherited text's distance from us by reading it in its original language, the other is to explore what it says within our world and language. Here the facing-pages of text and translation express this. These editions respect the original context by providing the best currently available Greek or Latin text, while the task of stating what it says today is found alongside it in the translation and in the notes and commentaries.

The process testifies to the living nature of these texts within traditions. Each volume represents our generation's attempt to restate the source in our language, cognisant that English is now the most widely used language among theologians either as their first language or their adopted language for scholarly communication.

BREPOLS LIBRARY OF CHRISTIAN SOURCES  
PATRISTIC AND MEDIEVAL TEXTS WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

6

EDITORIAL BOARD

Professor Thomas O'Loughlin, Director  
Dr Andreas Andreopoulos  
Professor Lewis Ayres  
Dr Lavinia Cerioni  
Professor Hugh Houghton  
Professor Doug Lee  
Professor Joseph Lössl  
Dr Elena Narinskaya  
Dr Sara Parks

Arnobius Iunior,  
*Praedestinatus*

*Translated, with an Introduction, by*  
**GUIDO STUCCO**

BREPOLS

Cover image: Ebstorfer *Mappa mundi* © Kloster Ebstorf.  
Used with permission.

© 2022, Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

D/2022/0095/84  
ISBN 978-2-503-59676-1  
eISBN 978-2-503-59677-8  
DOI 10.1484/M.BLCS-EB.5.126028

Printed in the EU on acid-free paper.

# Table of Contents

Introduction	7
1. The <i>Praedestinatus</i>	7
The Authorship of the <i>Praedestinatus</i>	7
Dating the <i>Praedestinatus</i>	9
2. Historical Background: Augustine and Prosper	10
Augustine's Views on Grace and Predestination	10
The <i>De gratia et libero arbitrio</i> (AD 426 or 427)	11
The <i>De correptione et gratia</i> (AD 426 or 427)	12
The <i>De praedestinatione sanctorum</i> (AD 428 or 429)	15
The <i>De dono perseverantiae</i> (AD 428 or 429)	17
Prosper's Contribution	18
The <i>Carmen de ingratis</i> (AD 429)	19
The <i>Responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Gallorum calumnantium</i> (AD 430 or 431)	20
The <i>Responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Vincentianorum</i> (around AD 434)	22
3. Structure and Contents of the <i>Praedestinatus</i>	22
<i>Praedestinatus</i> : Book 1	22
<i>Praedestinatus</i> : Book 2	23
<i>Praedestinatus</i> : Book 3	24
4. The Controversial Role of the <i>Praedestinatus</i> in Subsequent Theological Controversies	31
Medieval Developments	31
A Critique of Hincmar's Claims from Jansenius' <i>Augustinus</i> (1640)	34
Auvray's [Martin Barcos'] Reaction (1644) to Sirmond's Publication of the <i>Praedestinatus</i>	38
A Vindication of Hincmar's Claims in Sirmond's <i>Historia praedestinatiana</i> (1648)	43
Text and Translation	49
Praefatio / Preface	60
Liber primus / First book	66
Liber Secundus / Second Book	128
Liber Tertius/ Third Book	142

Further Notes	241
Headings	241
First Book	241
Second Book	242
Third Book	242
Bibliography	245
Ancient and Medieval Authors	245
Modern Authors	245
Index	249
Biblical Texts	249
Ancient and Medieval Names	253
Modern Authors	256

# Introduction

## 1. The *Praedestinatus*

The work presented here for the first time in English translation is called *Praedestinatus*. The French Jesuit Jacques Sirmond (1559–1651) discovered this anonymous text in the library of the Reims cathedral and published it in Paris in 1643 with the title *Praedestinatus. Praedestinatorum haeresis et libri S. Augustino temere adscripti refutatio*.

The text was published a second time in Venice in 1774. The third edition appeared in Migne's *Patrologia Latina* in 1865. The complete critical edition, based on five extant manuscripts, was published by Franco Gori:<sup>1</sup> this present translation is based on his critical edition.

Sirmond named this work *Praedestinatus*, a text consisting of three parts or books, due to a brief reference found in Book 3,15: "Listen to what the book *Praedestinatus* says now." Sirmond attributed its authorship to an African monk who came to be known as "Arnobius Iunior" (Arnobius the Younger), to distinguish him from Arnobius of Sicca, an African theologian and author of the polemical treatise *Adversus nationes*, who lived about one hundred fifty years earlier, at the time of the Diocletian persecution (end of the third century). In this work Arnobius the Younger comes across as a fierce opponent of the Augustinian doctrine of predestination and an ardent supporter of free will. He celebrates God's unchanging and steadfast love for all (e.g.: "This predestination, however, is not that with which God does violence to those who do not want good, but that in which he never changes his intention to do good," (3,20). He champions the idea that the *initium fidei* is up to human beings; that the human will enjoys a certain priority over grace (e.g.: "The grace of God is greater than the will of the human being, but the will, in this context, is prior to grace. Grace comes first in regard to merit; the human will comes first in regard to logical order," (3,13)); that the only predestination that does justice to the biblical text is predestination based on God's foreknowledge of humans' future merits; that God's salvific will is truly universal; that concupiscence is not an evil thing, but *bona* and *naturalis* *per se*.

### *The Authorship of the Praedestinatus*

Most scholars today agree with Sirmond's attribution of the text to Arnobius the Younger. This view, however, has recently been disputed in a thought-provoking

---

<sup>1</sup> Gori (2000).

article by N. W. James, who attributed instead the authorship of the *Praedestinatus* to Julian of Eclanum, Augustine's Pelagian opponent.<sup>2</sup>

The name Arnobius suggests that he was probably from northern Africa. As Franco Gori suggested, his African origins can also be inferred from his writings, considering his frequent citations of African theologians such as Tertullian, Cyprian and Tyconius; his knowledge of the basilica near Carthage, named *Restituta*; and his detailed description of the Tertullianist and Donatist movements.<sup>3</sup>

We know very little about Arnobius' life. It has been assumed that he was a monk who fled northern Africa after the AD 420 Vandal invasion of the Roman provinces. Some of the reasons for reaching this conclusion are the following: 1) in his works we find some references to himself as being a *servus dei*, a term usually designating monks; 2) he admitted feeling the responsibility that goes with being called *nonnus*, i.e., grandfather, a reverent expression reserved for older people and for elders in the Church;<sup>4</sup> and 3) he claimed to have embraced the "holy profession." Moreover, judging from some references to the "flock of God," and from his concern for "simple minded believers," he may have been a leader of a monastic community, or even a bishop.<sup>5</sup> After fleeing from Africa, Arnobius found refuge in southern Italy, whence he eventually made his way to Rome. He probably lived in the "eternal city" for the rest of his life, considering his knowledge of Roman society, geography (we owe to him some of our information concerning the sanctuary dedicated to the martyrs Processus and Martinian, located on the Via Aurelia),<sup>6</sup> ecclesiastical milieu, and liturgy.

From a theological standpoint, Arnobius was orthodox in his views, professing his faith in the teachings of the Church and proclaiming his devotion and submission to the Roman See. In an article written at the beginning of last century, Germanus Morin, documented Arnobius' faithfulness to the Nicaean creed; his use of the "Filioque" clause; his belief in the Incarnation and in the salvific efficacy of baptism; his veneration for the saints and his devotion to "Mother Church."<sup>7</sup> Morin lamented the absence of a critical edition of Arnobius' works and concluded that "*Arnobius est, dès le Ve siècle, un type accompli de ce que sera le moine d'Occident, un chrétien vivant*

<sup>2</sup> James (2018). Some of the reasons that led James to this conclusion were: 1) the emphasis on the goodness of *concupiscentia* (a topic over which Julian and Augustine feuded at length); 2) the celebration of the goodness of marriage, which is not to be thought of as inferior to the religious life; 3) the defense of the freedom of the human will after the Fall; and, 4) the recurrence of at least eight arguments typically employed by Julian. See James (2018), 255–61. One of the first people to write about the *Praedestinatus* and to attribute the authorship to Julian was von Schubert (1903).

<sup>3</sup> Gori (2000), xii. See also Morin (1936).

<sup>4</sup> See Arnobius's commentary to Ps 105 in PL 53, 486.

<sup>5</sup> References to a certain "*Arnobius episcopus*" are found in a catalogue of books donated to Saint Wandrille Abbey by a presbyter named Wandron (AD 742–47). The reliability of both Arnobius' biographical elements and alleged literary production has been questioned by James (2018), who claimed that: "There is absolutely no trace of a historical figure named Arnobius in any of the literature or biographical works of the fifth century; in particular he does not appear in Gennadius' *De viris illustribus*." James (2018), 249.

<sup>6</sup> Gori (1999), 43.

<sup>7</sup> Morin (1911).

*de la vie de l'Église et de sa liturgie sacrée.*<sup>8</sup> Some scholars have debated whether Arnobius' literary production reveals a clear Semipelagian orientation or rather a thinly disguised anti-Augustinianism (Arnobius never attacked or openly criticized Augustine) *per se* not deserving the label "Semipelagian."

What did Arnobius write? According to several scholars, Arnobius can be credited for writing the following works:

- 1) *Commentarius in psalmos*
- 2) *Conflictus Arnobii et Serapionis*
- 3) *Praedestinatus*
- 4) *Ad Gregoriam in palatio ordinatam*
- 5) *Expositiunculae in evangelium*

Morin has made the convincing case that the author of the *Conflictus* and the author of the *Commentarius*, whom Erasmus of Rotterdam in a letter to Pope Hadrian VI (1522) praised as "a most competent exegete," are one and the same person.

Prior to 1909 this view had been rejected by half a dozen scholars because of the alleged difference between the pro-Augustinian stance of a couple of passages in *Conflictus* and the Semipelagian orientation of the *Commentarius*. Following Wilmart's earlier suggestion that "there is no valid reason to deny Arnobius paternity of the *Conflictus Serapionis*,"<sup>9</sup> Morin pointed out nineteen parallels between the two works, concluding that Arnobius authored them both. According to Morin, the different attitudes toward the Augustinian views on grace and predestination in these two works, could easily be explained if we consider that "the Roman authority pronounced itself very energetically in favor of Augustine; thus, after AD 450, views on the subject of grace that could have easily been voiced thirty years earlier, were no longer tolerated."<sup>10</sup>

After establishing the common authorship of *Conflictus* and *Commentarius*, Morin documented thirty-four parallels between *Praedestinatus*' Preface, Books 1 and 3 on the one hand, and *Conflictus* / *Commentarius* on the other hand. His foregone conclusion: the author of the latter works, the monk Arnobius, is also the author of *Praedestinatus* (with the exception of Book 2). While Sirmond, Schubert, Morin and others denied the Arnobian origin of *Praedestinatus*' Book II, the Italian scholar Franco Gori has recently argued that, on the basis of literary evidence and lexicon employed, this text too should be attributed to the African monk.<sup>11</sup>

### ***Dating the Praedestinatus***

When was this work written? In the process of dating we need to consider the following:

- 1) In the Preface we find an allusion to the recently deceased Pope Celestine (*beatissimae*

---

<sup>8</sup> Morin (1911), 178.

<sup>9</sup> Morin (1911), 178.

<sup>10</sup> Morin (1909), 424.

<sup>11</sup> Gori (1999), 89, 90.

*memoriae Caelestinus*); 2) The Monophysite heresy, which emerged around 449, does not appear in the catalogue of heresies constituting Book I (the penultimate heresy mentioned in the catalogue is Nestorianism), thus marking this work's *terminus ad quem*; and 3) in Book I, mention is made of a letter promulgated by all the Eastern and Western bishops at the Council of Ephesus (431), thus making this Council a likely *terminus a quo*. Therefore, most scholars agree that Arnobius probably composed the *Praedestinatus* in Rome, during the pontificate of Sixtus III (432–40).<sup>12</sup>

## 2. Historical Background: Augustine and Prosper

### *Augustine's Views on Grace and Predestination*

Before analyzing the structure of *Praedestinatus* and the issues discussed in it, it is necessary to first revisit the view of predestination advocated by Augustine and of his most vocal follower, Prosper: only then we will be able to appreciate the contribution that this work makes and its well-deserved, though controversial, place in the history of theology.

When Augustine composed *De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum* in 397, he blazed a theological path that altered the landscape of western, Latin-using Christian faith for centuries to come. Augustine, who had not yet become a Christian but was on a spiritual quest that eventually culminated in his conversion, first met Simplicianus in 386.<sup>13</sup> Simplicianus had become Ambrose's successor as bishop of Milan and shortly after that, Augustine, now a bishop himself, outlined for him his views on eight biblical passages (most notably Rom 7:7–25 and 9:10–29). The reason why this text has been considered a watershed in Augustine's theological and intellectual development is that it forcefully and un-hesitatingly emphasized the initiative, primacy and efficacy of divine grace in people's conversion and faith, establishing predestination as the main architectural framework to understand the relationship between God and human beings. Gaetano Lettieri has documented how *De diversis quaestionibus* laid the theological foundation of the next thirty years of Augustine's literary production.<sup>14</sup> Lettieri did not hesitate to contrast this "new" Augustine (whom he called "the *other* Augustine") with the earlier Augustine. Stigmatizing the attempt of many scholars who attempted to relativize and diminish the importance of the doctrines of grace and predestination in the great bishop's life, Lettieri wrote:

The doctrine of [Augustine's] predestined grace is neither a marginal appendix nor an excess needing to be relativized, but rather the pulsating heart of the *other* Augustine, the Copernican revolution that generates a deeper and more adequate theological understanding of that Christian God to whom Augustine had fully

---

<sup>12</sup> Amann (1935 a), 2778. See also Gori (2000), xiii.

<sup>13</sup> Augustine recalled his encounter with Simplicianus in *Confessiones* 8, 2.

<sup>14</sup> Lettieri (2001).

converted in Milan. To ignore the central place it occupies in his theological system amounts to dilute Augustine's thought to a vague, intimate spiritualism which is parasitic in relation to its neo-Platonic metaphysical structures.<sup>15</sup>

Augustine (d. 430) spent the last three decades of his life writing specifically on the topics of divine grace, predestination and its relationship with human free will. What occasioned his last works was first what may be called the "Hadrumentum crisis," occurring between the years 425 and 427.<sup>16</sup> At this time Augustine dealt with the objections leveled against his views on grace and free will by some monks from the monastic community of Hadrumentum, located in modern Tunisia. The issue at stake was the relationship between divine grace and human free will.<sup>17</sup> Augustine upheld the priority and primacy of grace, which he regarded as a gratuitous gift rather than as something God owes us as a reward for the good deeds we perform. Although divine grace comes to our help our will is free and needs to cooperate with God's work in us; hence, the importance of correction and rebuke which God uses to accomplish his will. Augustine also introduced the idea of predestination as a way to explain why some people persevere to the end of their lives while others do not.

### ***The De gratia et libero arbitrio (AD 426 or 427)***

This text was written as a letter addressed to Valentinus, the abbot of the monastic community in Hadrumentum. In this work, filled with a multitude of biblical quotations, Augustine makes these seven main points:

- 1) We must uphold the existence of both free will and the need of God's grace. Without free will, the many warnings in Scriptures to heed God's voice would not make sense. Augustine quotes dozens of texts that appeal to a person's good will, without any fear of compromising his belief in the priority and primacy of God's grace. For to deny this primacy for the sake of free will amounts to contradicting several scriptural passages he adduced in defense of his view. To deny the primacy of grace would also mislead us into thinking that we are not as sinful as we truly are. Augustine reminds his reader of the testimony of Scriptures: "Thus says the Lord: Cursed is the man who trusts in human beings, who makes flesh his strength, whose heart turns away from the Lord" (Jer 17:5).<sup>18</sup>
- 2) Grace and faith are God's gifts; God does not give them to us as a reward for something meritorious that we have done, not even on account of our good will. Even Pelagius agreed with this view (though insincerely, according to Augustine)

---

<sup>15</sup> Lettieri (2001), 602. Translation mine.

<sup>16</sup> Harden Weaver (1996); Stucco (2006), 28–35.

<sup>17</sup> Augustine wrote three letters (Letters 214 and 215 to Valentinus; Letter 217 to Vitalis) and two treatises (*De gratia et libero arbitrio* and *De correptione et gratia*), which were also originally written as letters, in response to these objections.

<sup>18</sup> All biblical quotes mentioned in this Introduction as well as in the translation are from the New American Bible (Revised Edition).

when the bishops who had convened at Jerusalem questioned him, because he feared being censored for upholding a heretical view.

- 3) Special graces like conjugal chastity and virginity are God's gifts. Conversion too is a gift.
- 4) There are passages abused by Pelagians, who claim that: a) if you seek God you will find him as a result of your efforts; b) as you pursue righteousness, you will find it (some texts used by Pelagians include: "But you, man of God, avoid all this. Instead, pursue righteousness, devotion, faith, love, patience, and gentleness" (1 Tim 6:11); "So turn from youthful desires and pursue righteousness, faith, love, and peace, along with those who call on the Lord with purity of heart" (2 Tim 2:22); and c) the only grace not given according to merits is the forgiveness of sins. Augustine re-interprets these texts in light of grace's prevenient action on people's hearts and minds.
- 5) Faith, grace, love for other people and for God, are God's gifts and do not originate in the human will.
- 6) Faith needs to be informed by love (*fides caritate formata*) in order to be salvific.
- 7) Eternal life is both a gift and a reward for service. God crowns his gifts, not our merits as such. Pelagians claimed that the law, nature and the simple remission of sins are themselves the grace of God: they are all we need to attain eternal life. Augustine disagrees with this view and commends yet again St Cyprian's *On the Lord's Prayer*, in which the venerable martyr argued that "people must, nonetheless, ask for in prayer the things they are commanded to carry out in the Law" (13, 26).<sup>19</sup>

Augustine goes on to argue that not only faith and perseverance are gifts of God's grace, but salvation as well. God has predestined some people to be saved. Upon these people he bestows regeneration. It is only after they have been regenerated, that human beings begin to cooperate with the promptings of grace in their hearts. Thus, he claims: "He works, therefore, without us so that we will, but when we will and will so that we do the action, he works along with us; nonetheless, without his either working so that we will or his working along with us when we will, we can do nothing in terms of works of piety" (17, 33). In conclusion, Augustine upholds the primacy and priority of divine love over the human response to it. According to the Scriptures, we didn't choose or love God first, rather, it was he who loved us and chose us first, enabling us to love him in return. God acts on our will, including the unbelievers, as he pleases, yet our will remains free: "God works in the hearts of human beings to incline their wills to whatever he wills, whether to good actions in accord with his mercy or to evil ones in accord with their merits" (21, 43).

### ***The De correptione et gratia (AD 426 or 427)***

A monk brought back to Augustine a response from Valentinus, in which the latter assured the bishop of Hippo that he had been persuaded by the arguments set

---

<sup>19</sup> All quotations from this and the following three works cited here are found in Teske (1999).

forth in *De gratia*. However, Valentinus reported that there were other monks in his community who still had reservations about, and even objections to Augustine's views on grace and free will. Augustine's response, which may be regarded as forming one book together with *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, deals with two major issues: the role of reproach / rebuke / correction in God's plan of salvation, and the nature of predestination, which is introduced as the best possible explanation for why some people persevere to the end of their lives while others do not. Some scholars have regarded this text as "the *summa*" of Augustine's thought on grace and predestination.

Augustine begins his response by emphasizing that without Christ's grace none of our thoughts, actions, will or affections can be good. Augustine also reminds his audience that prayer plays an important role in receiving grace. Then, he addresses the main objection that is at the basis of the first part of this text: what is the point of rebuking somebody, if grace, which empowers people to do God's will, has not been granted to that person? As someone might say: "How do I not have through my own fault what I have not received from him, since unless it is given by him there is no other source from which I might have so good and so great a gift?" (4, 6) Augustine replies that people who think along these lines ought to be ashamed of themselves, since first they do what is evil and then want to avoid being reproached for it by blaming God for not helping them out, as if such help was due to them. According to Augustine, reproach is a good thing, because: "The pain, of course, which makes him displeasing to himself when he feels the sting of rebuke, rouses him to a desire for greater prayer in order that, helped by God's mercy through an increase of love, he may cease to do actions which he should be ashamed of and sorry for and may do ones which are worthy of praise and congratulations" (5, 7).

In other words, rebuke is the means through which God accomplishes his end, namely the salvation of many souls. However, Augustine also adds that rebuke only works when God allows it to be effective, and that he can correct people even without resorting to it. Moreover, Augustine reminds Valentinus that all people deserve to be rebuked because of Original Sin:

And for this reason the first evil by which one disobeys God is derived from a human being because, in falling by his own evil will from the rectitude in which God originally created him, he became evil. And ought we not to rebuke this evil in a human being because it is not a personal sin of the one rebuked, but a sin common to all? On the contrary, that which is common to all should also be rebuked in individuals. For it is not the sin of no one just because no one is exempt from it. These original sins are, of course, said to be the sins of others because individuals contract them from their parents, but they are not without reason said to be ours too, because, as the apostle says, all have sinned in that one (6, 9).

Next, Augustine engages in a lengthy discussion about perseverance. The main point in Augustine's treatise is that election, obedience, perseverance in doing good, and final perseverance are all God's gifts. For instance, we read in Jude 24: "To the one who is able to keep you from stumbling and to present you unblemished and exultant, in the presence of his glory." These gifts can ultimately be traced to God's decision to predestine some people to heaven. In that case, rebuke does not contradict the

primacy of grace but rather works as its instrument, bringing about God's intended results. God has chosen some people to receive the grace of final perseverance for reasons that will always elude us. We should not murmur against God, but trust that whatever he has decided is just and fair, for we can neither probe the depths of God's mysteries nor know why God has decided to give his grace to some and not to others. More baffling yet, we will never know why some people are called to the Christian life only to drop out of it as they fail to persevere in it. Augustine's answer to this dilemma lies in the words of Paul: "Oh the depth and riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How inscrutable are his judgements and how unsearchable his ways!" (Rom 11:33). What then follows in the treatise is a long discussion of Adam's condition and of the grace of God (10, 26–12, 35).

We need to remember a few more points made in this important treatise:

- Predestination precedes God's calling and election. Also, one may be called but not be elected, though it is always the case that if one is elected, one is also called (e.g., Mt 20:16; 22:14).
- Echoing 1 Jn 2:19, Augustine says that even though some people appear to be in the Church, they are not going to persevere to the end.
- God turns even the sins of the elect to their advantage.
- Against his critics' understanding of God, Augustine says that the reason why some people are saved is to be found in God's good will and pleasure, and not in the divine foreknowledge of what human beings are going to do out of their own free will (a concept referred to as *praedestinatio ex praevisis meritis*).
- The number of predestined is not only certain (God would know it anyway through mere foreknowledge), but also defined by God. Augustine talks about a "closed number which is not susceptible of being increased or decreased" (*numerus clausus neque augendus neque minuendus*).
- The true meaning of "God wants all to be saved" (1 Tim 2:4) is discussed in greater detail. "All" is not to be understood as "every person without exception," but as "every kind of person."

A year or two after Augustine wrote these letters, two of his followers (i.e., Prosper and Hilary) wrote to Augustine to inform him of the criticism that the latter's views had received in Marseilles and in other provinces of southern Gaul. These critics in Gaul claimed that the theory of predestination, upheld in Augustine's writings, was a novel theory; was useless for preaching; made exhortations to virtue useless since nothing can help a person who is predestined to damnation; would cause people to despair; and was unnecessary and unwelcome since it disturbed the less educated believers, or ordinary folks. Moreover, the monks in Provence alleged that: a) foreknowledge on God's part is foreknowledge of a person's future faith, not of what God himself has already decided to do; b) perseverance is a gift of grace that can either be lost or retained by the exercise of one's will; and c) human nature is not so debased that it cannot desire to be healed. Granted that God needs to do the healing, the desire to be healed has nothing to do with grace but is rather the outcome of human free will: the *initium fidei*, or *initium salutis*, is up to us human beings. Augustine replied with two treatises rebuffing these views, thus canonizing for the next centuries a view of

predestination that enjoyed a general consensus in the western church's theology up to the early fourteenth century, when Peter Aureol (c. 1280–1322) first departed in a substantial fashion from it.<sup>20</sup>

### ***The De praedestinatione sanctorum (AD 428 or 429)***

This treatise was addressed to Hilary and Prosper as a reply to the concerns they expressed to him in their letters. The issues discussed by Augustine in this long letter/treatise are: 1) the beginning and increase of faith; 2) election; and 3) God's predestination and foreknowledge.

At the beginning of his treatise, Augustine refers to 1 Cor 4:7 ("Who confers distinction upon you? What do you possess that you have not received? But if you have received it, why are you boasting as if you did not receive it?") to support his contention that not only the increase of faith (e.g., 1 Cor 3:6: "I planted, Apollos watered, but God caused the growth") and the performance of good works require the bestowal of grace (*pace* the Pelagians), but its very beginning as well. At one time, before he became a bishop, Augustine believed, like his new opponents did, that when a person hears the gospel being preached and believes, they are the originator of that faith (3, 7). But now, having changed his mind, he claims that even the beginning of faith is God's gift: in other words, he concludes that faith is the work of God. He argues that it is very arrogant for any person to claim that the beginning of their faith is a synergistic activity, partly theirs and partly God's work: "A human being makes a deal, as it were, with God and claims for himself a part of his faith and leaves a part for God. And what is more presumptuous, he claims the first part for himself and gives the second part to God, and in that work which he says belongs to both, he puts himself first and God second" (2, 6). Since in 1 Thess 2:13 Paul says: "And for this reason we too give thanks to God unceasingly, that, in receiving the word of God from hearing us, you received not a human word but, as it truly is, the word of God, which is now at work in you who believe," Augustine remarks that "it is of course vain and pointless if God to whom he gives thanks did not himself do this" (19, 39).

Next, Augustine introduces the idea that since faith is due to God's grace and not everybody has it, God must have elected only some people to believe: "Faith, then, both in its beginning and in its completeness, is a gift of God, and let absolutely no one who does not want to be opposed to the perfectly clear sacred writings deny that this gift is given to some and not given to others" (8, 16). As a way of example, Augustine refers to Jesus' words in the Scriptures: "For this reason I have told you that no one can come to me unless it is granted him by my Father" (Jn 6:65).

---

<sup>20</sup> Halverson (1998). Beside Aureol, many other other scholastics, both before and after him, (e.g. William of Champeaux (c. 1070–1121), Honorius of Autun (c. 1080–c. 1140), Gerard Odonis (1285–1349), William of Ockham (1285–1347), and Thomas of Strasburg (d. 1357)) were responsible for substantial deviations from the traditional (i.e., Augustinian) theological view of predestination. See Stucco (2017), 59–94.

At this point some people may object that if this was really the case, God would be unfair, partial and not really loving. Why, some might ask, does not God give faith to everybody? Augustine replies by quoting Paul's argument found in Rom 9:19–24 (though one might legitimately question whether Paul was talking about salvation and faith in this context), to the effect that no one can argue with God. Moreover, God could not possibly will anything unrighteous. Then Augustine, echoes Paul: "Oh, the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How inscrutable are his judgments and how unsearchable his ways!" (Rom 11:33). Thus, Augustine concludes: "He teaches out of mercy all those whom he teaches, but of judgment does not teach those whom he does not teach" (8, 14). Augustine introduces other texts to support his view. Consider for instance Jn 15:16: "It was not you who chose me, but I who chose you and appointed you to go and bear fruit that will remain," and 1 Jn 4:10: "In this is love: not that we have loved God, but that he loved us and sent his Son as expiation for our sins." The magnificent verse of Eph 1:4 is also quoted by Augustine: "He chose us in him, before the foundation of the world, to be holy and without blemish before him." If this is not predestination, Augustine might have said, I do not know what is! Again, election is the cause of faith, not vice-versa, as we also read in Rom 8:30: "And those he predestined he also called; and those he called he also justified; and those he justified he also glorified."

Next, Augustine deals with the complex issue of the relationship between God's foreknowledge and predestination. What comes first? Does God foreknow people will believe because he has willed that they would (this is Augustine's preferred interpretation, namely predestination without or before foreseen merits, in Latin, *sine or ante praevisione meritis*) or is he willing to help people with his grace because he has foreknown that they would respond favorably to it (namely, predestination *ex praevisione meritis, or post praevisa merita*)? Another way to word the question is: does God give us his grace as a reward for our foreseen meritorious conduct or is his grace the very reason of our meritorious conduct?" Augustine writes: "The Pelagian says: 'Therefore, he knew who were going to be holy and spotless through the choice of their free will, and for this reason, before the creation of the world, he chose in his foreknowledge those whom he foreknew would be such people'" (18, 36). Augustine disagrees with this view. The verb "chosen" is an act stemming from the divine will and not from foreknowledge, as he reads in Eph 1:5: "according to the good pleasure of his will." And when Paul discusses the reason why we were chosen, he concludes that it was not because God knew that we were going to be holy (i.e., God's foreknowledge), but in order (i.e., to fulfill God's will) that we may be "holy and without blemish before him."

Augustine argues that "Predestination is the preparation for grace, while grace is the actual bestowal ... .... Predestination cannot exist without foreknowledge, but foreknowledge can exist without predestination. By predestination, of course, God foreknew those things which he himself was going to do" (10, 19). Moreover, Augustine looks at two instances. In the first instance, that of infants who die before they attain the faith, he concludes that it is absurd to say that God deals with them on the basis of his foreknowledge of their future merits. In other words, Augustine rejects the idea that those children whom God knows would have believed if only

they had lived longer are saved, while all the others whom God knows would not have believed, are not. Therefore, Augustine concludes that the fate of children who die in infancy is decided by predestination and not by divine foreknowledge. In the second instance, the Son of God was foreordained, not merely foreknown, to become incarnate.

In conclusion, Augustine expresses his dismay at the fact that we do not trust God more than ourselves to do a better job in matters relating to our salvation. Augustine says:

I am truly amazed that human beings prefer to entrust themselves to their own weakness rather than to the firmness of God's promise. "But," someone says, "I am uncertain about God's will for me." What then? Are you certain about your own will for yourself? And do you not fear these words: "Let one who thinks he stands watch out that he does not fall" (1 Cor 10:12)? Since each of these, therefore, is uncertain, why does a human being not entrust his faith, hope and love to the more firm rather than the less firm? (11, 21).

### ***The De dono perseverantiae (AD 428 or 429)***

According to Augustine, the testimony of the Scriptures is that final perseverance is a gift of God freely bestowed by his grace "according to his most hidden and at the same time most just, most wise and most beneficent will" (*secundum ipsius Dei secretissimam eandemque iustissimam, sapientissimam beneficentissimam voluntatem*) (13, 33), and not something earned by humans' meritorious conduct. The following is a good summary of Augustine's view concerning the effects of predestination:

The definite decision of God's will, therefore, concerning predestination comes to this: Some, having received the will to obey, are converted from unbelief to the faith or persevere in the faith, while others who dally in the enjoyment of sins worthy of condemnation, even if they are predestined, have not yet risen up, because the help of merciful grace has not yet raised them up. For, if some are not yet called whom God predestined by his grace to be chosen, they will receive the same grace by which they shall want to be chosen and shall be chosen. But there are some who obey, but are not predestined for his kingdom and glory, they last only for a time and will not remain up to the end in the same obedience (22, 57).

In this text Augustine famously defined predestination as "the foreknowledge and the preparation of the benefits of God, by which he most certainly sets free whoever are set free" (14, 35). This saying captures the main features of the Augustinian view of predestination, namely: a) its good news ("God's benefits" and "deliverance"); b) its intrinsic efficacy (evidenced by the adverb "most certainly" (*certissime*)); c) its particularity (evidenced by the term "whoever"); and d) its gratuity (mention of "benefits," not of well earned "rewards").

At first, Augustine uses Cyprian's treatise *De dominica oratione* and claims that the five petitions in the Lord's Prayer teach us about predestination, even though Cyprian did not explicitly focus on this doctrine. Can final perseverance be obtained

in prayer? It surely can, but only by those upon whom God had already decided to bestow it. Can final perseverance be lost? No; however, if it was never given, one will not persevere; but if it was given, it cannot be lost. Why is it then, that only some people receive it? It is impossible to understand God's choice: his judgments are unsearchable, for who has been God's counselor?

Augustine re-affirms that unbaptized children are lost and that it is uncertain whether we are among the predestined as long as we live: "No one can be secure regarding the eternal life which God, who does not lie, has promised to the children of the promise before eternal times unless this life which is a temptation upon the earth has come to an end" (22, 62). Finally, Augustine replies to two objections against his understanding of predestination. When his critics uphold predestination based on divine foreknowledge rather than will, they do not realize that if God already knows what is going to happen, the outcome is certain and unchanging (even though it is brought about by free willing subjects) just like in the version of predestination he himself advocates. Also, according to Augustine, wisdom, prudence and chastity are gifts of God's grace that are not necessarily bestowed on every human being; could it be that final perseverance is yet another instance of such gifts?

Augustine reminds his readers that predestination does not exclude exhortation, preaching and rebuke. Moreover, just like wisdom and continence, perseverance too is a gift of God. He concludes the treatise with an exhortation to preach predestination as being very expedient to Christian growth in holiness (22, 57).

### ***Prosper's Contribution***

After Augustine died, his faithful disciple Prosper took it upon himself to defend the bishop of Hippo's teachings. Prosper (end of the fourth century—after AD 455) was a lay theologian, a devout follower of Augustine and a fierce opponent of what came to be called Semipelagianism.<sup>21</sup> Prosper lived for some time in Marseilles, where he first became acquainted with the Massilians' views of God's grace and human nature promoted by the local monastic community, as well as by the monasteries of Lerins and St Victor. He then traveled to Rome, where he became a secretary to Pope Leo I. Prosper upheld the main themes of his master, though he gradually but increasingly toned down the harsher elements in Augustine's views on predestination and the divine salvific will. His contribution to the Semipelagian controversy consists of several treatises and letters written in response to Augustine's critics;<sup>22</sup> one whole book written

---

<sup>21</sup> In my five-volume history of the Catholic doctrine of predestination I have refrained from employing the term Semi-Pelagianism because I do not agree that this theological way of thinking (more than a movement) was "half-Pelagian." I have opted instead to use the term "Semipelagianism," without the hyphen. For the origin of the term itself, see Jacquin (1907). See also the more recent and exhaustive research on the topic by Backus and Goudriaan (2014).

<sup>22</sup> See *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula objectionum Gallorum calumnatum*; *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula objectionum Vincentianarum*; *De gratia Dei et libero arbitrio contra Collatorem*. For a translation of these works see De Letter (1962). All quotations in this Introduction are taken from this source.

anonymously about God's salvific will (*De vocatione omnium gentium*);<sup>23</sup> one collection of theological views about divine grace (the so-called *Indiculus*); possibly one book, written anonymously (the so-called *Hypomnesticon*); a poem of a thousand and two verses (*Carmen de ingratis*);<sup>24</sup> and two letters, one written to two presbyters from Genoa, and another to a friend of his, a certain Rufinus. Like his teacher Augustine, Prosper was a great champion of the necessity and gratuity of grace.<sup>25</sup>

Let us now take a closer look at these works, in order to have a basic understanding of how Prosper understood the concepts of grace and predestination.

### ***The Carmen de ingratis (AD 429)***

This work summarizes Prosper's view about the relationship between grace and free will. In this poem he addresses his opponents as "*ingrati*." The "*ingrati*" are ungrateful people "whom grace stirs into wrath, whose every work you wish to depend upon your own wills" (v. 685). Prosper fully understood what his Semipelagian opponents were saying and therefore cannot be accused of misrepresenting their views. See, for instance, this accurate summary of his opponents' understanding of grace:

Grace calls and invites all men, and, overlooking no one, desires to bring salvation to all and absolve the entire world of sin. You believe, however, that every man obeys the voice of his own free will, and through the use of his own judgement and decisions, reaches out toward the light that is offered, a light that withdraws itself from no one, but helps those who desire what is good and enlightens those who so desire. Hence, under the guiding goodness of God, our helper, zeal for virtue grows stronger, so that each man pursues with unfaltering devotion what he has learned must be sought for in accordance with God's commands. All souls that have been taught by the goodness of God share the same freedom, which enables them in their perseverance to complete their holy course, an end and object that is under the influence of God's bounty and never lacking to virtuous souls. But since all men do not possess the same strength, and since the will is dissipated and drawn in many different directions by the allurements of the world, some men succumb to vice of their own free will who could have saved themselves from falling and remaining standing firm.<sup>26</sup>

To this view Prosper opposes what he regards the truly orthodox understanding of grace:

It is really grace which grants the good disposition of will, inasmuch as faith, which seeks an object of belief, is itself the fruit of grace and creates merit in the will... It is grace which awakens the slumbering fire from the dying amber. Thus, grace is the mother of the will and the inspiration of works; it is not the result

---

<sup>23</sup> For a translation of this work see De Letter (1952).

<sup>24</sup> For an edition and translation of this work see Huegelmeyer (1962).

<sup>25</sup> See Hwang (2009) and Elberti (1996).

<sup>26</sup> Huegelmeyer (1962), 59.

of merit, because that which is not done through it is not meritorious ... If then, believing that merit can precede faith, you attribute merit to the good works of an unbeliever, or, if you wish to regard your faith as begotten from free will, and not received as a gift from a Benefactor, salvific grace finds no place in you. It has been excluded by your puffed up wills.<sup>27</sup>

Prosper's main criticism against his opponents was that they championed free will too enthusiastically, at the expense of divine grace: "Yet you complain that when grace makes us whole, our free will is taken away, and you consider that it is destroyed by the life that is glowing within us." In the *Carmen de ingratis* Prosper also stresses the following four points:

- The particularity of grace. He asks his opponents how can they be so sure that God's grace does not pass people by? Indeed, that seems to be the case of the unevangelized, of un-baptized babies and of certain individuals in the Scriptures.
- The gratuity of grace. According to Prosper, faith and repentance are not a reward given by God for our good will and intentions. Prosper used as an example the abrupt conversion of notorious sinners. These people have done nothing to deserve God's favor, and yet they turned their lives around and embraced the Gospel: Their darkness was removed, and they came to know God in his mercy when death itself was pressing close upon them, and they were almost drawing their breath. Cleansed by the gift of baptism and set free from the world's shackles, they exchanged hell for heaven. What merit on their part can you reckon with here? If you examine the past of such men, it was evil. If you look for merit after their conversion, there was none.<sup>28</sup>
- The inner working of grace. Rather than limiting ourselves to the external, stimulating influence of grace on our lives, we need to confess the inner, effectual and irresistible work of grace within our heart and soul. Take the case of the conversion of obdurate sinners: "Grace has done this, not merely by cajoling or teaching with kindly urging, as though it had the same nature as the Law, but rather by transforming the mind from within and through its creative power molding a new vessel from one that has been shattered."<sup>29</sup>
- The monergism in salvation: "Grace is begotten by the action of God working alone [emphasis mine] in the soul, reforming the mind."<sup>30</sup>

### ***The Responsiones ad capitula objectionum Gallorum calumnantium (AD 430 or 431)***

An anonymous Semipelagian writer wrote a concise list of fifteen objections to Augustine's views on predestination and grace. Among these criticisms were the charge that predestination amounts to fatalism; that Augustine teaches positive reprobation; that predestination denies God's universal salvific will; that it implies limited atone-

---

<sup>27</sup> Huegelmeyer (1962), 71.

<sup>28</sup> Huegelmeyer (1962), 69.

<sup>29</sup> Huegelmeyer (1962), 63.

<sup>30</sup> Huegelmeyer (1962), 71.

ment; and that Augustine should have spoken of God's foreknowledge rather than predestination. Prosper gave a firm and clear response to each and every objection.

I will not summarize in detail Prosper's replies, except to note these points. First, Prosper denies that God predestines anybody to be damned: "It is not God who forsook them that they should forsake him; it is they who forsook him and then were forsaken" (Art. 3). At the end of his treatise, in the "Qualification to Article 14," he adds that anyone who believes in positive reprobation "is not a Catholic."

Second, Prosper rejects the doctrine of limited atonement. However, he goes on to say that even though Christ died for all, not everybody profits from his death. Third, we cannot understand God's ways, but we can be sure that he is just and that he does not play favorites. Lastly, Prosper departed from Augustine's view of divine reprobation based on the gravity of Original Sin to develop the theory of divine desertion of sinners after foreseen demerits. According to this theory, a person is forsaken due to God's foreknowledge of the sins that person will commit during his/her lifetime. Augustine briefly mentioned this view in his *De correptione et gratia* 13, 42: "They forsake and are forsaken" (*deserunt et deseruntur*). This principle was paramount in Prosper's thought to explain why some people have not been predestined by God to salvation. Seven times in this short treatise Prosper says that people perish, not because they were not predestined but due to their own evil ways:

- 1) "And since God's prescience was neither uncertain nor mistaken about the future actions of this man, he never elected nor predestined him, nor did he set apart from eternal damnation him who was to be a reprobate" (Art. 2).
- 2) "If these sinners die an impenitent death, this does not mean that their damnation was necessary because they were not of the predestined. Rather, the reason why they were not of the predestined is that God foreknew they would be impenitent through their own fault" (Art. 3).
- 3) "Of their own free wills they changed from good to evil. And though they were reborn from sinfulness and made just, yet they were not predestined by God, who foreknew that they would be impenitent" (Art. 3).
- 4) "He foresaw that they would fall through their own fault and for that reason did not by his predestination set them apart from the sons of perdition" (Art. 7).
- 5) "Consequently, God does not withdraw from any man the grace of living in obedience to his will because he did not predestine him, but rather he did not predestine him because he foresaw he would swerve from obedience" (Art. 12).
- 6) "Accordingly, the unbelief of unbelievers should not be referred to God's disposition but to his prescience. The infallibility of this prescience, which could not err about their future unbelief, does not entail that they refused to believe of necessity" (Art. 14).
- 7) "God's omnipotence could, it is true, have given the strength to stay faithful to those who were to sin; yet his grace did not forsake them before they themselves forsook him. It is because God foresaw that they would do so through their own fault that he did not include them among the elect that were predestined" (Qualification of Article 7).

It is important to remember that Prosper is not saying that the elect were predestined by God on the basis of the good deeds and merits that he foreknew, but rather that those

who are damned are forsaken by God on the basis of his foreknowledge of their sins or demerits. As he will say again in *Responsiones ad capitula objectionum Vincentianorum*: “And because God foresaw that they would fall, they were not predestined. They would have been of the predestined, should they have come back to God and persevered in holiness and truth. And so we conclude that the predestination of God is for many the reason of their perseverance in grace and for none it is the reason of their fall” (Art. 12).

### ***The Responsiones ad capitula objectionum Vincentianorum (around AD 434)***

An anonymous author penned sixteen objections to Prosper’s and Augustine’s views on predestination and grace. According to this author, Augustine’s views imply, among other things, a denial of God’s universal salvific will and positive reprobation; that God is the author and instigator of sin; that we have no choice but to do evil; and that God predestines people to sin.

Prosper was indignant that such objections could have even been made in the first place. He responds that if a person is saved, it is God’s gift, but that if he/she is lost, it is his/her own fault. God only foreknows sin: it is criminal and irresponsible to ascribe to God the cause of one’s damnation, since he causes no one to fall: “God does not push them to fall nor to cast them out that they should forsake him. Yet, He foreknew their sin and their defection by his infallible prescience” (Art. 16). However, the reason why some people receive grace but others do not, remains an unfathomable mystery. God does not actively cause bad will or sins, but permits them, leaving people in a state into which they have fallen of their own fault.

It is at this particular point in time that the work being translated here for the first time in English, the so-called *Praedestinatus*, comes into play. Put succinctly, this work represents an attempt by its anonymous author to combat what he regarded a dangerous heresy stemming from Augustine’s and Prosper’s teachings: the heresy of predestinationism, which the author claims was surreptitiously promoted by a hidden sect acting as a fifth-column within the Church.

As mentioned at the beginning of this Introduction, in 1643, Sirmond, a Jesuit and one of the most learned men of his time, published this text, which he discovered in the library of the Reims cathedral. We shall return presently to discuss Sirmond’s contribution to the diffusion of this text. But now let us turn to the historical context surrounding this text and its author.

## **3. Structure and Contents of the *Praedestinatus***

### **Praedestinatus: Book 1**

The first book is a brief description of ninety heresies that had plagued the Church during the previous four hundred years. This type of literature is called “heresiology.”<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> See, for instance, McClure (1979).

The author states at the beginning of his work that he has used Hyginus, Polycrates, and Epiphanius as his main sources. However, he fails to mention the main influence behind his compilation, namely, Augustine's *De haeresibus*, a list of eighty-eight heresies written around the year 428 for the deacon Quodvultdeus,<sup>32</sup> which Arnobius shamelessly plagiarized. The reason for his elaborate description of these heresies is twofold. First, Arnobius wants to show that he is a champion of orthodoxy, a *defensor catholicae fidei*, ready and willing to engage heresy wherever and whenever he finds it. The bellicose language he employed in his Preface was probably meant to impress the Roman ecclesiastical court he frequented. Second, and most important, he wants to expose the hidden roots of the predestinarian heresy's dualism and fatalism, which he pointed out especially in the case of the Marcionite, Apellite and Manichean heresies.<sup>33</sup>

### **Praedestinatus: Book 2**

The second part of the *Praedestinatus* is a short treatise or *libellus*, espousing a radical version of Augustinianism. Arnobius introduces this *libellus* as the product of the ninetieth heresy, predestinarianism, which he regards as the most horrible and dangerous heresy of all, because it attributes evil and sin to God himself. According to this *libellus*, God has already decided beforehand who will go to heaven and hell (double predestination). In this *libellus* we read an astonishing statement: "Thus, we believe in our hearts that those whom God once predestined to life, even if they become negligent, or sin, or refuse to come along, are led to eternal life against their wishes. Conversely, we also believe that those whom God predestined to death, even if they run or hasten, they work in vain" (2,3). According to such an extreme predestinarian view, striving for holiness is vain, since the human will does not play any role in a person's salvation and does not cooperate with divine grace. Also, baptism does not really make a difference in a person's life, unless one is in the number of the elect. Finally, concupiscence remains in a person after baptism, as a perpetual source of sin.

The interesting question about this second part of *Praedestinatus* concerns its origins. Where did it come from? Was it really a document written by a member of a mysterious predestinarian sect operating in secret within the Catholic Church (a view upheld by Sirmond, H. Schubert,<sup>34</sup> and G. Morin, but rejected by M. Cappuyns, E. Amann, and F. Gori), as Arnobius claims? Or was it a spurious document written by an anonymous source? Or was it, as F. Gori has recently argued, Arnobius' own literary device? According to Gori, Arnobius first manufactured this text in an attempt to slander the Augustinian view of predestination by claiming that the predestinarian heretics attributed the paternity of this text to Augustine; having set up an artificial

---

<sup>32</sup> See Teske (1995). Augustine used Epiphanius for his description of heresies 1–57; Philastrius, for heresies 58–80; and drew from his own experience for heresies 81–88. See also Sadowski (2015); and Van Geest (2020).

<sup>33</sup> Gori (1999), 120, 121.

<sup>34</sup> Schubert (1903), 114–18.

“straw man” he then proceeded to knock it down in the third and final part of his work. Arnobius claims that predestinarian heretics used to secretly read this *libellus* among themselves. He claimed that one day, a woman with a “virile spirit,” after receiving the text was so appalled by what she read that she gave it to some people whom she knew were orthodox Catholics, soliciting their opinion. Arnobius was therefore able to read this text and to refute it (3,31).

### Praedestinatus: Book 3

The third part of the *Praedestinatus* consists in a detailed refutation of most paragraphs of the *libellus* making up the previous book. Here Arnobius attempts to refute the notion of double predestination and to set forth an authentically Catholic view of grace and free will and of their relationship.

But what about the identity of the *Praedestinatus* (i.e., The Predestined One)? Francis Gumerlock has made the very convincing case that Prosper of Aquitaine was the person Arnobius was addressing in his polemical work with the sarcastic title of “the predestined one.”<sup>35</sup> Gumerlock reached the conclusion, on the basis of several pointers, that this text was not merely a denunciation of a heretical sect but more like a polemical treatise addressed to a specific individual. First, there is the fact that Arnobius switched in several instances from the “you” plural to the “you” singular both in the *Praedestinatus* and in his *Commentarii in Psalmas*, thus addressing a real flesh and blood person. Second, Arnobius defended himself from the charge of Pelagianism hurled at him by a non-identified individual who could best be identified with Prosper himself, considering his propensity to do so.<sup>36</sup> Third, a number of circumstances concerning Prosper’s attitudes and theological method makes it easier for us to identify him as the target of Arnobius’ *odium theologicum*.<sup>37</sup>

In the third book, Arnobius targets the doctrine of double predestination. First, he takes issue with the idea that God has decreed, even before human beings were actually created, that some people, namely the elect, will go to heaven. If that was the case, Arnobius suggests, not only God’s will would not truly be universally salvific, but, worse yet, all the scriptural exhortations addressed to people to repent of their sins and to turn to God would be rendered ineffective, pointless and even self-contradictory. Take for instance 1 Pt 3:20, which contains a reference to the story of Noah’s ark. This letter – imagined then to be the work of Peter himself – mentions “God patiently waiting in the days of Noah.” According to the Genesis account, a period of a hundred years elapsed between God’s foretold destruction (Gen 5:32) and the actual flood (Gen 7:6). Arnobius wonders what the wait was all about:

---

<sup>35</sup> Gumerlock (2013).

<sup>36</sup> Gumerlock (2013), 255, 256. We should not forget that Prosper did not shy from personal *ad hominem* attacks, as in the case of Cassian, who took the brunt of his displeasure in *De gratia dei et libero arbitrio contra Collatorem*. There, Prosper called Cassian a “dialectician;” and accused him of “sophistical conclusions,” of developing a “new and proud doctrine,” of double talk or insincerity, of “serving the cause of heretics,” and of “incoherence and contradiction.”

<sup>37</sup> Gumerlock (2013), 256–58.

“Tell us: what was God’s patience waiting for? Was it waiting for a predestined destruction or rather for an encouraged conversion?” (3,3) Also, the warnings given by God to the people in Ezekiel 18 and 33 strongly suggest that God does not want anyone to perish but wants everyone to repent and live. Thus, the idea of predestination and the need to obey God’s commandments (which are meant for everyone to follow, not just for the elect) are at odds with each other. Arnobius suggests we should believe in either one or the other, since we cannot have our proverbial cake and eat it too.

Arnobius goes on to reject the idea, implied in predestination, that our destinies are fixed by God’s eternal and irrevocable decree. Predestinarians are fond of quoting Rom 9:22, which talks about “vessels of wrath made for destruction.” Arnobius has no problem admitting that God has created from all time a punishment for a *category* of people, but that does not mean that he has eternally decreed that *specific individuals*, even before they were born, are to be confined to such a category. As a matter of fact, the opposite is true. In 2 Tim 2:20, 21 we read: “In a large household there are vessels not only of gold and silver but also of wood and clay, some for lofty and others for humble use. If anyone cleanses himself of these things, he will be a vessel for lofty use, dedicated, beneficial to the master of the house, ready for every good work.” According to Arnobius, Paul – like all involved in this debate he has no suspicion that this letter is pseudo-Pauline and so will happily read it in conjunction with Rom – in this text is suggesting that it is indeed possible to change one’s status in life, from sinner to believer. The inescapable conclusion drawn by Arnobius is that one’s lot has not been pre-determined and irrevocably fixed by God before all time.

However, predestinarians reply that in Rom 9:10–13 we read about God loving Jacob and hating Esau, even before they were born and had done anything to either please him or displease him. Arnobius replies that in Gen 25:23 the two sons of Isaac are described as “two nations” and as “two peoples... one stronger than the other, and the older shall serve the younger.” Arnobius claims that Esau and Jacob are the prefigurations of the Jewish people and of Gentiles, respectively. Thus, he upholds corporate election rather than predestination of individuals.<sup>38</sup>

But it is not only predestination to glory and the idea that human destinies are sealed before our birth that profoundly irritate Arnobius. Some of his strongest criticisms are reserved for the obnoxious idea of positive reprobation, namely the belief that God has already decided that some people will go to hell, no matter what they do, and that he actively causes them to sin. To Arnobius such a view makes no sense; worse yet, it is utterly blasphemous, since it makes God the author of sin, relieving sinners of their moral responsibility. Arnobius uses a couple of examples to reject the illogical character of positive reprobation. First, he claims:

It appears that sin is definitely not the sinner’s responsibility. But if one who sins is not guilty at all (and we know that all things that God condemns are foreign to

---

38 For a defense of corporate election, see Shank (1970); Bowman (2002); Klein (2015).

him), then it follows that a person is the material executor of the deed, while God himself is responsible for the sin ... No one is so irreligious as the person who is appalled by something he himself predestined, and who punishes the deed that he himself foreordained to take place. (3,4)

Then, keeping the pressure on his predestinarian opponents:

Should we blame a person who did not eat at another person's home, if the latter did not invite him/her? Rather, should not such a person be commiserated, when the host invites other people but rejects him/her? It would be an incredible cruelty if that person was forbidden to join the party and then ordered to be killed by the same host who did not want to invite him/her to dinner in the first place. (3,29)

Arnobius focuses on the blasphemous aspect of the theory of positive reprobation. First he says: "But if you were to say: 'A person is evil because God wanted him/her to be so, and not because they did not want to be good,' you will prove to have blasphemed God, and confirm that God wanted them to be evil. In this case, it will be necessary for the Church to cast an anathema upon people like you, for blaspheming God" (3,13). Arnobius suggests that nothing short of excommunication will take care of the predestinarian heretics, since they are guilty of the greatest blasphemy of all. This is how Arnobius puts it:

Obviously, the devil wants and desires that every sin be committed; consequently, you must believe that God has established his predestination to satisfy the devil's desire and to bring about the death of human beings. You must also believe that God wanted his predestination to be subjected to the devil's will, thus abandoning guilty human beings to his enemy, the devil, even before they had a chance to act, with great satisfaction of demons, I may add. (3,8)

Arnobius' conclusion is quite dramatic:

Beloved, all the members of my body are growing numb; my heart faints; my hearing weakens; my face grows pale; my hair stands straight up on top of my head; my mind is afflicted with paralyzing fear in its deliberations; my tongue cannot move in my mouth. I beseech you, let us speak up against those who say that God wants to subject himself to the devil's will. (3,8)

In regard to damnation, Arnobius clearly states that it is not God who damns people but rather human beings damn themselves. The modern reader may recognize a popularization of such a view in C.S. Lewis's *The Great Divorce* (1946).

Since Arnobius condemned in such strong terms the theory of double predestination, we would expect him to be radically opposed to the idea of predestination per se. But this is not the case. Rather, Arnobius, re-interpreted the doctrine of predestination according to the standard Semipelagian perspective. Predestination, Arnobius claims, is a biblical idea, based on God's *universal salvific will, mercy and foreknowledge* rather than on his decree or will. For instance, Jesus instructed his disciples to make disciples of all people and to baptize them (Matt 28:19–20). Thus, he predestined all people to eternal life because he called everyone to repentance. Arnobius insists that God

is not a respecter of persons;<sup>39</sup> therefore, it is absurd to assume that he just calls *some* people (i.e., the elect). Arnobius asks his predestinarian opponents: “Where do you read that not everybody is called to his grace, or that Jesus, who prays for those who were crucifying him, does not want to save someone?” (3,8) At this point, Arnobius establishes a connection between election and redemption. Since Jesus died for all (e.g., Rom 8:32; Titus 2:11), he calls all, which is to say, he potentially predestines everyone for heaven. A case in point is this: Jesus prayed for his persecutors: “Father forgive them ...” (Lk 23:34). Again, Arnobius insists that predestination is based on God’s foreknowledge rather than on his foreordination of human events. Arnobius uses Rom 8:29, 30 to make his point, as he understands the term “foreknew” in a temporal sense: “God foreknew those people among the Gentiles who would accept with sincere heart his Son (whom the Jews were going to crucify), and who would worship the Son of God, as it was fit and proper” (3,8). This view of Arnobius is supported with a verse found in John: “Jesus knew from the beginning the ones who would not believe and the one who would betray him” (Jn 6:64).

After setting forth a vigorous critique of double predestination and positive reprobation, Arnobius analyzes the relationship between grace and free will. Supporters of the doctrine of predestination had accused their Semipelagian opponents of dangerously leaning toward Pelagian beliefs. The charge was a serious one; enough to discredit a person accused of it. In order to deflect the charge, Arnobius adopts a double strategy. First, he explains what a proper Catholic understanding of the relationship between grace and human free will is all about, making sure to emphasize the priority and importance of divine grace. Then, he pronounces five anathemas against Pelagian beliefs (3,30).<sup>40</sup> Arnobius insists: “For we do not put the human will before divine grace; since we attribute everything that is good not to prideful humans, but to a merciful God” (3,13). So far, so good. Then, he goes on to affirm the primacy of divine grace: “The grace of God is greater than the will of human beings,” he claimed, adding:

The human will would not be endowed with the strength to will, unless the only begotten Son, coming down to us from heaven, had not opened wide the gates of his grace. As he came on earth, he suffered for all people. Thus, in this sequence, the grace of God precedes a person’s will ... God’s grace occurs before and indeed is superior to the will. It was not us sinners who first approached the Holy One; rather, it was the Holy One who came to us sinners (3,13).

The existence of divine grace also enjoys chronological priority in history over the human will, since it precedes and anticipates our response in faith: “Since God invited you in order that you may seek, he made it possible for you to find; if you will not seek, you will not find either: this is up to your free will. You have such a

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Rom 2:11 (and Gal 2:6; Eph 6:4; Col 3:25, and note the dependence on 2 Chr 19:7 and Job 34:19).

<sup>40</sup> Gori rightly suggested that Arnobius’ anti-Pelagianism is quite modest in scope, since it is aimed only against the views of Caelestius rather than those of Pelagius and of Julian of Eclanum. See Gori (1999), 55.

great faculty of free will that you are even able to despise your Lord as he calls you. Therefore, whoever is saved owes it to God's grace, who made it possible for you to will." (3,13). Arnobius concludes:

Not only I will say that grace comes first, but also that God does not disdain to reach out to people and to come to us, who had not asked. So, until now, the will of God has preceded the will of human beings. He wants us to be saved, but we do not want to. Woe to me and to the likes of me, because grace, the invitation and the will of God, repentance, the promise of eternal life, and the fear of eternal punishment – all these things precede our wills, every day. Thus, every day the will of God, which is filled with countless mercies, precedes our wills (3,23).

But if Arnobius upholds the ontological primacy, chronological priority and pre-emptive activity of grace, why should he still be regarded as a Semipelagian? The answer is rather simple: by insisting on the occasional *priority* of the human will in receiving grace and on the bestowal of predestination based on human beings' behavior as it was foreknown by God, Arnobius clearly departed from Augustine's views and sided unequivocally with the Semipelagianism that will later be condemned at the Second Council of Orange (AD 529). According to Arnobius, just as in the general history of humankind (i.e., in the greater picture) God's grace always has the initiative (e.g., in creating the world, in offering forgiveness and divine help, in sending the Son and the Spirit), likewise in the particular history of individual human beings (i.e., in the smaller picture) the human will precedes grace. Arnobius explains: "We say that the will precedes grace in these two cases: in the performance of baptism and in the conversion leading to penance." (3,13). Thus, in full accord with standard Semipelagian tenets, Arnobius goes on to say:

We argue against your interpretation, saying that the human will precedes the grace of God. In fact, the Lord did not say: "You will receive first, so go ahead and ask; you will find first, so then, go ahead and seek; it will be opened to you first, so then go ahead and knock." On the contrary, the Lord said: "Ask and it will be given to you; seek and you will find; knock and the door will be opened to you. For everyone who asks, receives; and the one who seeks, finds; and to the one who knocks, the door will be opened." By saying "everyone" he established a general principle and excluded particularism from his predestination; and by saying "One who asks receives" he established the priority of the human will rather than of the gift of grace (3,13).

Arnobius supplies three examples to back his claim that the human will, in the case of individuals, enjoys chronological priority over grace. First, he suggests that human beings are like sick people and that God is like a physician. The physician offers his help and expertise (i.e., priority of grace); but the patient must acknowledge his/her disease and ask for help and be willing to follow the cure (i.e., priority of the will). In the second example, Arnobius compares people to beggars. God's mercy and bounty are offered to us, who are poor beggars; hence the priority of grace. However, beggars still have to accept the offer, by first extending their hand; hence the priority of the will. In the third example, Arnobius compares God's wisdom and grace to a beautiful maiden who is being introduced to a man: "In this instance, grace precedes the will;

grace stirs the heart, seduces the heart and awakens one who is asleep” 3,23). Such fortunate man will be able to marry her only if he first willingly receives her at the hand of her father. Arnobius concludes: “Thus, we have shown you how the grace of God both precedes and follows the human’s will. It precedes it, because it calls you, cajoles you, invites you to come. It also follows it, because when you come, want, and ask, it offers itself to you.” (3,23).

The last three major views upheld by Arnobius in this book of the *Praedestinatus* are: 1) the existence of free will; 2) the effectiveness of baptism; and 3) the belief that concupiscence is naturally good.

The Predestinarians targeted by Arnobius had denied the existence of free will and claimed that God seals our destinies even before we were born. Consequently, according to them, free will is just a pagan notion with no backing in the Scriptures. According to Arnobius, the denial of free will has three dreadful consequences. First, by suggesting that people are not really the cause of their actions, human responsibility is seriously impaired: “If the freedom of choice was lost, how can human beings be sinners? In all truth, we are sinners for no other reason that we want what God does not want and do not want what God wants.” (3,27). Second, denial of free will dampens human beings’ zeal, desire to do good and striving toward holiness, paralyzing their initiative. Predestinarians are accused by Arnobius of distorting the meaning of Ps 126 (127):1: “Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build. Unless the Lord guard the city, in vain does the guard keep watch.” Arnobius firmly rejects the moral apathy, the spiritual quietism and the lack of religious zeal promoted by extreme predestinarians. These people allegedly insisted that one should not endeavor to lead a holy life, since such an effort borders on hubris. According to them, since people are unable to be good, it is God who infuses grace in those whom he chooses to be holy. Thus, all one needs to do is to wait for God’s grace to “grab” him/her, propelling him/her forward. In his commentary to Psalm 127, Arnobius says these people have seriously misunderstood the meaning of the text. According to him, the text is not a call to inaction, but a warning to acknowledge the priority and primacy of God’s initiative over human works. In the *Commentarii in psalmos*, Arnobius finds a christological key to unravel the meaning of this Psalm. In the Old Testament some righteous people strove to build God’s city, or kingdom, on earth: Abel, Enoch, Noah, the patriarchs, Moses all endeavored to follow and to promote respect for God’s law. According to Arnobius, if Jesus had not come their effort would have been vain; this is why the Jews, since Christ’s advent, work in vain. Spiritually speaking, the synagogue has built walls, but it lacks the roof; it has a door, but the door is not marked by Christ’s blood. Thus, its workers work and toil in vain. Arnobius concludes that this is the true meaning of Psalm 127:1, which, again, is not a call to refrain from building God’s city on earth, but rather to humbly acknowledge the prevenient work of God in history.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Augustine, in his *Enarrationes in Psalmos 126 (127): 2* wrote about this particular Psalm: “The Lord Jesus builds his own house. Many work hard in the process of building, but unless he himself builds it, ‘those who build it labored in vain.’ Who are the people who work hard in the process of building it?”

Third, Arnobius rejects the idea that people are dragged into the kingdom of God kicking and screaming, that is to say, against their will. Predestinarians often use the example of Paul, who persecuted Christians and who was then turned around by God's grace, who reached out for him in the desert. Arnobius denies that Paul's situation can be used by predestinarians in support of their beliefs. Paul was not unwilling, but willing; he was animated by a wrong zeal for the Lord. Arnobius believed that Paul had written: "I was once a blasphemer and a persecutor and an arrogant man, but I have been mercifully treated because I acted out of ignorance in my unbelief" (1 Tim 1:13). And, Arnobius excuses Paul's behavior on the ground that by persecuting the church he was acting like a servant patrolling a vineyard at night. Armed with a stick, such a servant attacks the owner, as he walks through the vines, vaguely making out a human shadow, though he is not able to recognize his own master. As the master makes his presence known, the servant, having cast the stick aside, falls on his knees and begs for forgiveness. Now, such a servant does not deserve to be punished because he was trying to protect the owner's property from any intruder. Thus, Paul was not an unwilling subject whom God compelled to believe, but rather a willing but misguided servant who was corrected by his Lord. Having freely and willingly accepted God's correction by acknowledging Jesus who appeared to him on the way to Damascus, Paul proved to be not an automaton but a free subject. After all, according to Arnobius, Paul could have dismissed Jesus' appearance as a hallucination, but he did not.

As far as baptism is concerned, Arnobius proves to be a strong sacramentarian, taking to heart the saying in 1 Pt 3:21: "... during the building of the ark, in which a few persons, eight in all, were saved through water. This prefigured baptism, which saves you now." He firmly believes in the efficacy of baptism and thus takes offense at his predestinarian opponents' suggestion that baptism does not have any ultimate salvific effect or regenerating power.<sup>42</sup> Arnobius' predestinarian opponents quote Rom 8:24 to the effect that we were saved in hope but not *ipso facto*:

In reality, the activity of corruption that crept into human nature as a consequence of the Fall, remains in the baptized person just as the root of a hair remains in the head when the latter is cleaned and shaven at the surface with a razor. The hair is shaven in order to clear an area of the head; however, it is not uprooted, and thus

---

It is all who preach the word of God in the Church, the ministers of God's sacraments. We all run, we all work hard, we all are engaged in the process of building now; and even before us, others have run, worked hard and built: but 'unless the Lord builds it those who build it labored in vain.' The Apostles themselves saw some people rushing to their own destruction, and more specifically Paul said: 'You are observing special days, and months, and seasons, and years. I am afraid that my work for you may have been wasted' [Gal 4:10]. Because Paul personally knew that the house is built by the Lord he commiserated these people among whom he worked fruitlessly."

<sup>42</sup> Gori wrote: "Augustine repeatedly rejected this accusation which he considered to be unfair, pointing out in several instances the difference between nature's *vitia* and a person's *peccata* and between original sin and its consequences – a distinction which his opponents did not understand or refused to understand, due to the fact that, according to him, their shameless pride induced them to think that they could be sin-free." See Gori (1999), 59.

grows back again. For if the entire weakness of Adam's transgression had totally been removed through baptism, every baptized person would not be drawn to sin by experiencing arousal of passions; no one would be contaminated by human pollution; no one would be affected by the stirrings of lust. (2,7)

As far as concupiscence is concerned, Arnobius argues that it is not an evil thing:

Take away concupiscence and there will no longer be married couples and the rewards of chastity will end as well. What kind of evil is it, I ask, if it is shown to be the cause of a double good? If it shows some people in the joy of generation and others in the triumph of virtue? ... Therefore, we receive from the Creator this impulse of concupiscence, just like all other members of our body. And so, if concupiscence is a bad thing because sometimes adultery is perpetrated through it, then we may as well say that the hand is also a bad thing, because through it, homicides are committed ... Thus, we have proven that concupiscence not only contributes to couples the help of fertility, but that it also bestows the crown of virtue to those who practice continence. (3,37)

Book 3 ends with a vague eschatological threat, based on Rom 1:32, directed at predestinarians and their supporters: "It is written that not only those who commit iniquities, but also those who agree with them will be found guilty in the end."

#### 4. The Controversial Role of the *Praedestinatus* in Subsequent Theological Controversies

##### ***Medieval Developments***

Let us now take a closer look at how Arnobius' claim that there was a predestinarian sect at work within the Church was revived in the course of later theological disagreements concerning grace, predestination and free will. After the *Praedestinatus*, the existence of a predestinarian sect is mentioned again in what is commonly called the Pseudo-Jerome's *Indiculus de haeresibus*, yet another fifth-century heresiological work. We find this statement in some manuscripts of this text immediately after the thirty-eight heresy: "Up to this point, it was all Jerome's work. But what follows has been composed by Gennadius, the holy priest from Marseilles."<sup>43</sup> We may recall here that Gennadius (died 496) was an ecclesiastical writer and a priest from Marseilles, the "hot-bed" of Semipelagianism, who authored *De viris illustribus* and *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*. The predestinarians' heresy appears in the *Indiculus* as the thirty-ninth in a list of forty-seven heresies; it is preceded by the heresy of Eunomius (died 393) and followed by the heresy of Nestorius (386–450). Thus, we may infer that according to the author of this part of the *Indiculus*, the heresy of the predestinarians arose during the first half of the fifth century.

---

<sup>43</sup> PL 81, 644. See also Bardy (1929).

The quote concerning the predestinarians reads as follows:

The predestinarians are those who say that God did not create human beings so that they would be saved, but only in order to adorn the world with a multitude of people. They say that even though Jesus said in a general sense: “Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will give you rest” [Mt 11:28], he did not really address his call to everybody, so that they may answer it. On the one hand, they claim that not all who answer Jesus’ call under his inspiration do in fact receive perseverance in doing good works; even after many good works and after obtaining the fruit of righteousness, unless they belong to the number of those who will be saved, at some point in their lives the power to do good is going to be withdrawn from them so that they will not endure in goodness. On the other hand, those who have been predestined to eternal life, even if they revel for a long time in unbelief and in all kinds of sins, at a certain point are bound to accept the opportunity to believe and to live according to God’s will in order that they may join the community of the righteous. With this view in mind, predestinarians strive to teach that God is an acceptor of persons; that he draws to salvation some people against their will after they committed many bad deeds; and that he rejects some others after they performed all kinds of good deeds, forcing them to sin, thereby causing them to perish forever.<sup>44</sup>

In the following centuries, the Augustinian views on predestination and efficacious grace were firmly upheld by two Popes (i.e., Gregory I and Hadrian I), by Isidore of Seville, and in numerous prayers of three ancient sacramentaries (i.e., Leonine, Gelasian and Gregorian).<sup>45</sup> However, in the ninth century a controversy arose, which historians usually refer to as the Carolinian dispute over predestination, whose two central opposing figures opposed were the monk Gottschalk of Orbais and Hincmar, the archbishop of Reims. In course of this dispute several theologians were consulted and took sides with either one of these two antagonists. Unfortunately, this controversy took a tragic turn when harsh punishment was meted out by Hincmar to Gottschalk who ended up spending the rest of his life in prison and utter isolation.<sup>46</sup>

Hincmar began his treatise *De predestinatione dei et libero arbitrio posterior dissertatio* (859)<sup>47</sup> claiming that the teachings on predestination adopted by Gottschalk traced their root to an ancient predestinarian heresy which first arose around 430, during the reign of emperors Theodosius II (408–50) in the West and Valentinian III (425–55) in the East; during the pontificate of Celestine I (422–32); at the time of the spreading of Nestorianism; and shortly before Augustine’s death at age seventy-six (430).<sup>48</sup> Quoting Gennadius and Hyginus as his sources for the existence of such a sect, Hincmar claimed that “predestinationism” first arose in parts of Gaul and

---

<sup>44</sup> PL 81, 644.

<sup>45</sup> For a selection of prayers reflecting Augustine’s views, see Stucco (2008), 22–59.

<sup>46</sup> For the writings and life of Gottschalk, see Gumerlock (2010).

<sup>47</sup> PL 125, 65–472.

<sup>48</sup> PL 125, 69–71.

Africa while Augustine was still alive; unfortunately, supporters of this sect began attributing to the saintly bishop their own works in order to lend credibility to their ideas. In *De dono perseverantiae*, Augustine talks about the “new heretics,” whom Hincmar identifies without hesitation as the “predestinarians” (he goes on to claim that Augustine wrote against “African predestinarians” in his *De correptione at gratia*)<sup>49</sup> he is criticizing. According to Hincmar, Prosper’s preface to his *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula objectionum Vincentianarum* and Pope Celestine’s writings show that the Church was battling them, as well. For Hincmar, the priest Lucidus’ condemnation at the Council of Arles (475) represents yet another chapter in the Church’s struggle against predestinarians. Moreover, in a letter to Lucidus, bishop Faustus of Riez, after rejecting Pelagius’ teachings, anathemized anyone who claimed that: a) God’s foreknowledge imposes damnation on some people; b) a person who is damned was not given the possibility to be saved (*non accepisse ut salvus esse posset*); c) a vessel of shame cannot turn into a vessel of glory; d) Christ did not die for everybody, nor does he want everyone to be saved.<sup>50</sup> Hincmar claims that ancient predestinarians such as Lucidus and Monimus, who was corrected by saint Fulgentius, were the forerunners of the modern predestinarians (i.e., Gottschalk and his supporters): thus, the Church’s past condemnation of such people ensured the condemnation of like-minded heretics who would arise in the future as well. Having established a connection between past and present predestinarian heretics, Hincmar briefly recalls the events that led to Gottschalk’s condemnation, referring to him as *novorum praedestinationorum primicerius* (chief of the new predestinarians),<sup>51</sup> and *signifer et praevius atque huius pravae doctrinae modernus resuscitator* (standard bearer and modern revivalist of this ancient and depraved doctrine).<sup>52</sup>

In a letter to Pope Nicholas I, Hincmar reported that Gottschalk, like his predestinarian predecessors, claimed that:

- 1) Just as God called some people to eternal life, likewise he predestined some others to eternal damnation.
- 2) God does not want all human beings to be saved, but only those who are saved (unless we are willing to say that those who are saved are saved against his will).
- 3) Jesus’ redemption was not for the whole world, but only for those who are saved.
- 4) When explaining 2 Pt 2:1 (“There will be false teachers among you, who will introduce destructive heresies and even deny the Master who ransomed them”), we must understand that the Lord purchased these people by the sacrament of baptism, but not that he carried the cross and shed his blood for them.

After Hincmar, two more writers mentioned the existence of a predestinarian sect: Flodoard (894–966), a French monk and chronicler, and Siegerbert of Gembloux (1035–1112), a Benedictine historian. Flodoard merely reproduced Hincmar’s letter

---

<sup>49</sup> PL 125, 163.

<sup>50</sup> PL 125, 80.

<sup>51</sup> PL 125, 85.

<sup>52</sup> PL 125, 89.

to Pope Nicholas I,<sup>53</sup> without adding his own opinion. But in his *Chronica cum auctariis*, Sigebert claimed:

In 415 the heresy of predestinarians began to slowly grow. The *praedestinati* were called this way because concerning the topics of divine predestination and grace they claimed that the toil of good works does not benefit those who live piously if they have been predestined by God to eternal death; nor does it hurt the impious to live immorally if they have been predestined to eternal life. This view diverted good people from pursuing good things and encouraged evil people to do evil. This heresy is said [*dicitur*] to have begun from a misunderstanding of Augustine's books.<sup>54</sup>

### ***A Critique of Hincmar's Claims from Jansenius' Augustinus (1640)***<sup>55</sup>

In his monumental (2680 pages) and controversial *Augustinus*, Cornelius Jansenius registered his dismay at the claim concerning the existence of a predestinarian “fifth column” within the Church. He said he found it “absolutely strange” (*vehementer mirum*) that this heresy had never been mentioned nor refuted by either Augustine or Prosper in any of their writings. Likewise, he said, it was strange that no ecclesiastical writer, prior to Hincmar and Sigebert, ever shed any light on the existence and beliefs of this predestinarian sect.<sup>56</sup> For instance, the very learned saint Isidore, in his seventh-century catalogue of heresies, mentioned the Pelagians but omitted the “predestinarians” because there was no such sect! Jansenius remarked:

I conclude that there never was a predestinarian heresy, nor predestinarian heretics. On the contrary, the Catholic doctrine taught by Augustine and Prosper was slanderously described as a heresy by the Massilienses. Thus, the ‘predestinarian heretics’ were none other than Augustine, Prosper and Hilary and all those who followed their teachings.<sup>57</sup>

Jansenius defended his claim by establishing the following points. First, Augustine made no mention of this heresy. Second, according to Hincmar, the predestinarians’ heresy first appeared in Africa, and then, after Augustine’s death, in Gaul; but this period coincides with the time when the criticisms of Augustine’s views on grace and predestination were first articulated by Semipelagians. Augustine himself remarked in his *De dono perseverantiae* (428) that his books *De correptione et gratia* and *De gratia et libero arbitrio* had been negatively received. Third, Hincmar claimed that the predestinarian heresy “was refuted by the authority of Pope Celestine and at the urgency of saint Prosper.”<sup>58</sup> And yet, it is a historically established fact that

---

<sup>53</sup> PL 135, 177–80.

<sup>54</sup> PL 160, 76.

<sup>55</sup> Jansenius (1640), Tome I, Book 8, Ch. 23, 227–31.

<sup>56</sup> Jansenius (1640), 227–28.

<sup>57</sup> Jansenius (1640), 228.

<sup>58</sup> Jansenius (1640), 228.

Prosper fought very hard in his writings (e.g., *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectiorum Gallorum calumniantium* and *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectiorum Vincentianarum*) against those who slandered and misrepresented the views of Augustine on grace and predestination; and that Pope Celestine did not silence with his authority the “predestinarians,” but rather those who said that Prosper and Augustine were teaching erroneous views (Celestine, in his *Letter to the Gallic Bishops*, decried those who aimed to Augustine’s “*memoriam dissipare*”). Thus, according to Jansenius, Hincmar failed to understand that the papal reproach was aimed at the Massilian monks and clergy for making a straw-man out of Augustine’s writings. Fourth, the first among those who criticized the dogmas of the predestinarians was the Massilian presbyter Gennadius, who was suspected of or infected with the “Semipelagian heresy,” and even so, not slightly (Gennadius, in his *De viris illustribus*, reproached Augustine for being too verbose and Prosper for attacking the “salutary works” of Cassian). Jansenius refers to the Pseudo-Jerome’s *Indiculus* and remarks that while the first heresy mentioned by Gennadius was that of the “Predestinarians,” the latter conveniently failed to mention Pelagianism and Semipelagianism. Fifth, all the beliefs that Gennadius, Hincmar and Sigibert attribute to the “predestinarians” are the very same teachings that Semipelagians unfairly attributed to Augustine.<sup>59</sup>

More specifically, Jansenius argues that for each of Gennadius’ descriptions of the predestinarians’ views found in the *Indiculus*, there is a corresponding rebuttal in Prosper’s writings:

- 1) The predestinarians are those who say that God did not create men so that they would be saved, but only in order to adorn the world with a multitude of people. The Massilians made a virtually identical objection to Augustine: “There are some men whom God did not create for eternal life but only for the greater welfare of the present world and for the utility of other” (Art. 13).

However, as Prosper answered to this objection: “When a Christian looks at the darkness that enwraps the unbelievers and at the light that shines on the faithful, is he not aroused by that very contrast to greater fervor in his thanksgiving to God? Can he not learn from the eternal loss of the reprobate into what misery he himself would rush headlong of his own free will, did not the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ come to his assistance?” (Answer, 13).

- 2) “They say that even though Jesus said in a general sense: ‘Come to me all who labor and are burdened and I will give you rest’ (Mt 11:28), he did not really address his call to everybody, so that they may answer it.” The Massilians reproached Augustine for teaching: “Those who were called were not all called in the same manner: some were called to faith, others to unbelief” (Art. 5). Prosper retorted that God’s call through the preaching of the Gospel is addressed to everybody, even though only the predestined will heed it; the others will willingly ignore it to their own detriment. As far as God calling some to unbelief is concerned, this is a misrepresentation of Augustine’s views: “But it is nonsensical to say that

---

<sup>59</sup> Jansenius (1640), 229.

some were called to unbelief, as though the call was the cause of their unbelief and the preaching of the gospel turned them into infidels" (Answer 5).

- 3) "On the one hand, they claim that not all who answer Jesus' call under his inspiration do in fact receive perseverance in doing good works; even after many good works and after obtaining the fruit of righteousness, unless they belong to the number of those who will be saved, at some point in their lives the power to do good is going to be withdrawn from them, so that they will not endure in goodness." Jansenius notes that the first part of this statement is indeed Catholic doctrine, and undeniable (*nec a quodam negari potest*):<sup>60</sup> Augustine expressly taught it (the Massilians accused him of saying: "God denies final perseverance to some of his sons who were reborn in Christ and endowed with faith, hope and charity, because in his foreknowledge and predestination they were not set apart from the mass of the reprobate" Art. 7). As far as the second part of this statement is concerned, the Massilians used to say against Augustine: "Some of those who were called and who lead a pious and righteous life are deprived of the grace of obedience to God's law, in order that they should cease to obey him" (Art. 12). Augustine himself said that this way of describing predestination is tactless; it is more precise and expedient to say: "But if any obey, but are not predestined for his kingdom and glory, they last only for a time and will not remain up to the end in the same obedience" (*De dono perseverantiae*, 22).
- 4) "On the other hand, those who have been predestined to eternal life, even if they revel for a long time in unbelief and in all kinds of sins, at a certain point they will accept the opportunity to believe and to live according to God's will, in order that they may join the community of the righteous." Jansenius noticed how Gennadius and Augustine used different expressions. Gennadius said: "will accept the opportunity," while Augustine said: "will receive the same grace." Jansenius points out that the expressions "opportunity to believe" and "receiving God's predestined grace" stem from two different views of the capabilities of the human will after the Fall.<sup>61</sup>
- 5) "With this view in mind, predestinarians strive to teach that God is an acceptor of persons." This is the eternal complaint of Semipelagians against the Catholic doctrine of predestination, which then prompts them to blame the following statement of the "predestinarian heresy" (i.e., the Catholic view).
- 6) "God draws to salvation some people against their will, after they committed many bad deeds; and he rejects some others after they performed all kinds of good deeds." Again, this is the lie against the work of grace which Pelagians appeal to in order to justify their refusal to embrace Augustine's teachings. True, if God predestined to eternal damnation certain people on account of their foreseen sins, no good works of theirs can benefit them; and vice versa, if God predestined some people to eternal life, none of the sins they previously committed can possibly

---

<sup>60</sup> Jansenius (1640), 229.

<sup>61</sup> Jansenius (1640), 229.

alter God's predestination. However, it is absolutely not true (*non omne verum quolibet modo*) that God does this *against their will*.<sup>62</sup>

7) And, "forcing them to sin, thereby causing them to perish forever." Again, Jansenius states that this is the most heinous (*invidiosissime*) way to misrepresent or caricature Augustine's teachings. Semipelagians are notoriously guilty of. The Massilians accused Augustine of saying: "By God's predestination men are compelled to sin and driven to death by a sort of fatal necessity;" and "God by his own power drives men to sin" (Art. 11; *Answers to the Vincentian Articles*, Articles 10–15).

Jansenius concluded: "Unless I am mistaken, all these things show that Gennadius made up this 'predestinarian heresy' to cast the accepted Catholic view into a bad light."<sup>63</sup>

Having dealt with Gennadius' additions to the *Indiculus*, Jansenius turns next to Hincmar's description of the beliefs of the "predestinarians" in his letter to Pope Nicholas:

- 1) "Just as (*sicut*) God called some people to eternal life, likewise (*ita*) he predestined some others to eternal damnation." The Semipelagians had a distorted view of what Augustine taught about eternal damnation (e.g., *Answers to the Vincentian Articles*, Articles 13, 15, and 16), and made it look as if God forces people against their wills to go meet a fate they neither asked for, nor wanted.
- 2) "God does not want all people to be saved, but only those who are saved." Massilians accused Augustine of saying: "God does not wish all Catholics to persevere in the faith but wants a great number of them to apostatize" (Art. 8). Semipelagians hated the idea that only a closed number of predestined people are going to heaven. And yet this is what Saint Augustine taught.
- 3) "Jesus' redemption was not for the whole world, but only for those who are saved." Again, Jansenius repeats his charge that the predestinarian heresy is nothing other than the Massilians' ancient slander against Augustine and the doctrine of the Church.

While we could excuse Hincmar for accepting the idea that a predestinarian sect existed in the past, as he followed Gennadius' false lead, Jansenius says that we cannot forgive him for accusing Gottschalk of teaching heresy, considering that none of these statements upheld by the Saxon monk were heretical. Not only that, but Gottschalk's views were upheld as orthodox and as faithful expressions of the teachings of Augustine, Prosper and Fulgentius by the very learned archbishop of Lyons, Remigius, in his *De tenenda Scripturae veritate* (today scholars attribute this work to Florus) as well as by the canons of the Council of Valence (855).<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Jansenius (1640), 229.

<sup>63</sup> Jansenius (1640), 230.

<sup>64</sup> Jansenius (1640), 231. Florus' text can be found in PL 121, 1083–1184. I have summarized each of the fifteen chapters of this book in Stucco (2008), 186–95. For the canons of Valence see Denzinger (2012, English edition), paragraphs 625–34.

### ***Auvray's [Martin Barcos'] Reaction (1644) to Sirmond's Publication of the Praedestinatus***

When Sirmond published the *Praedestinatus* in 1643, it supplied him with several arguments to refute what he called “the insolent opinion of certain people” (i.e., Jansenists) who had criticized the views on predestination found in the works of Baronius, Suarez, and Molina – all three of whom were fellow Jesuits with Sirmond. First, the teachings contained in the *Praedestinatus* offered a strong refutation of divine predestination based on God’s will rather than on his foreknowledge. Second, the absolute priority and primacy of God’s grace at the expense of human free will was rejected by the author of the *Praedestinatus* in favor of cooperation between the two elements. Sirmond clearly saw that these views agreed with the Molinist understanding of predestination. Third, Sirmond tried to argue that the author of the *Praedestinatus* had conclusively proven the existence of an underground predestinarian sect in the fifth century, and that the Jansenists were the spiritual heirs of this “fifth column.”

The reaction to Sirmond’s views by Jansenius’ supporters were not slow to appear. Martin Barcos (1600–1678), French theologian and nephew of Jean du Vergier de Hauranne (the first abbot of Saint-Cyran monastery), writing under the pseudonym of “Mr. Auvray,” firmly denied the existence of such a sect and accused Sirmond of using the excuse of an imaginary predestinarian heresy to disparage the sound teachings of Augustine concerning predestination. Modern scholarship has vindicated Barcos’ denial of the existence of such a sect. E. Amann, writing in the twentieth century about Sirmond’s effort to prove the existence of a predestinarian sect, concluded: “It is truly sad to see this old man (he was eighty-nine at the time) accumulate arguments in order to give to the clearest texts a meaning that was diametrically opposed to their obvious original one.”<sup>65</sup>

The book written by Barcos carried the title *Censure of a book published by Fr. Jacques Sirmond concerning an ancient manuscript which he entitled [the] “Praedestinatus.”*<sup>66</sup> This book, or better, this book review consisting of seventy pages, is divided into five chapters. In the Preface, Barcos qualifies the manuscript as “replete with errors, heresies, false claims, and coarse, ignorant and extravagant statements.”<sup>67</sup> He goes on to say that not only does the *Praedestinatus* echo the worst views upheld in the past by Pelagians and Semipelagians, but that the thesis that a predestinarian heresy and sect really existed in church history is nothing but a “phantom and a chimera of the enemies of the teachings of St Augustine,”<sup>68</sup> who used it as a “scarecrow” to discredit them.

Chapter One (pp. 6–25) is entitled: “Errors, heresies and extravagant claims of this book” and there Barcos voices his strong objection and disapproval of twenty-two

---

<sup>65</sup> Amann (1935 b), 2804.

<sup>66</sup> Auvray (1644).

<sup>67</sup> Auvray (1644), 5.

<sup>68</sup> Auvray (1644), 5.

points<sup>69</sup> contained in the *Praedestinatus*. Barcos decries the “Pelagian statements” contained in the book and blames its anonymous author<sup>70</sup> for believing that the human will does not receive *new* powers and strength from God’s grace but is merely awakened to *its own* potential. Barcos faults the anonymous author for not saying

69 The twenty-two points are:

- 1) When St Paul persecuted the Church, he did not sin because he acted in ignorance. Ignorance and lack of awareness are not culpable.
- 2) Not only Paul did not sin by persecuting the church: he was like Elijah, Abraham and Isaac. Thus, he did not shift from un-faithfulness to faithfulness: rather, he was conformed in the faith he already possessed.
- 3) God predestined all nations to goodness and to eternal life: it is only because human beings reject God’s design that they end up damned. Thus, God’s predestination can be thwarted because it is fallible and mutable.
- 4) God does not predestine people to damnation or eternal life on the basis of his will, but of his foreknowledge of what people are going to do.
- 5) Rom 7: 14–25 applies to human beings in general, and not to Paul in particular.
- 6) A baptized person no longer has a carnal law at work within himself/herself, opposing the law of the Spirit.
- 7) The concupiscence found among the baptized precedes their actual sins.
- 8) Concupiscence is the God-given means to increase humankind.
- 9) The author merely repeats Julian’s arguments against Augustine on concupiscence and marriage.
- 10) Concupiscence is not an evil thing, but the source and cause of some virtues, such as chastity and continence.
- 11) Only the abuse of concupiscence is wrong (like partaking of the Eucharist unorthodoxly).
- 12) The author condemns as impious those who claim concupiscence is one of the effects of the Fall.
- 13) The only problem with concupiscence is that sometimes it opposes reason and the Spirit.
- 14) Sex is the essence of marriage: the joining of the bodies makes marriage what it is.
- 15) The ancient just of the Old Testament were acceptable to God on account of their following natural law (Barcos remarks that this was what Faustus and Pelagians taught; on the contrary, the Church has always taught that we cannot please God without faith. Moreover, Barcos insists that the Second Council of Orange’s Conclusion expressly condemned such view).
- 16) The author of the manuscript opposed the orthodox view of grace more like a Pelagian than a Semipelagian; he reduced grace to the sacraments and to God’s salvific will; and finally, by ignoring the action of God’s grace within us, and by exclusively focusing on its external action, he reduced grace, in typical Pelagian fashion, to Free Will, Law and the Gospel teachings, thus destroying the true grace of Jesus Christ, which according to Barcos is able to deliver our will from its natural infirmity and powerlessness to do what is good.
- 17) The freedom bestowed by the Spirit is common to both elect and reprobates.
- 18) The *arbitrium* is in the soul, while the *libertas* is in the body.
- 19) Jesus’ words: “No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draw him” (Jn 6:44), simply refer to the general condition of God’s mercy calling everyone.
- 20) Baptism bestows perfection of grace and justice.
- 21) The author of the manuscript says that Pelagius was condemned, not because he claimed that people can cease to sin by using well their free will, but because he exalted too much the freedom of free will in rejecting the assistance of God.
- 22) The author claims that the yearning for God’s grace is an act of the will unaided by grace; according to him free will is healthy enough to obey God’s commandments without the inner work of divine grace.

70 Barcos refused to attribute the text to Arnobius the Younger because he found it to be written in a different style than Arnobius’ other works, namely *Conflictus cum Serapione* and *Commentarii in psalmos*. Contrary to Barcos’ view, modern scholars have confirmed the Arnobian paternity of the *Praedestinatus*.

with Paul that grace bestows the power to will what is good to the human will, and for merely claiming that prevenient grace requires the existence of free will.

In Chapter Two (pp. 26–34), entitled “False claims, fables and grossly ignorant statements made by this author,” Barcos hones in what he perceives as inaccuracies found in the first book of the *Praedestinatus*: among thirteen other things, he faults the anonymous author for according a favorable treatment to Tertullian and Origen.<sup>71</sup> Barcos also blames him for misquoting a couple of passages from the New Testament (e.g., Paul in Rom 9:12 says “by he who calls,” not “by he who foreknows”); for quoting a text that does not exist in the Bible (“The Father never draws someone against their will”); and for drawing erroneous consequences from them.

Chapter Three (pp. 34–50) is entitled “The errors and the heresies that this author attributes to those whom he calls ‘Predestinarians’ are nothing else but the objections and the criticisms that Pelagians and Semipelagians raised against the doctrine of St Augustine and of the Church.” After identifying seven criticisms raised against Augustine,<sup>72</sup> Barcos repeatedly brings up the same objection: this anonymous author was a Semipelagian who wrote the book *Praedestinatus* in order to discredit the

---

<sup>71</sup> See for example, *Praedestinatus*, 1, 26: “... Tertullian, who had previously written mostly well and in an un-surpassing way” and 1, 86: “He published very eloquent and passionate short writings in defense of the truth.”

<sup>72</sup> The author, whom Barcos does not hesitate to characterize as “an ignorant man, an impostor and a counterfeiter,” slandered Augustine and the orthodox teachings of the Church, by attacking these “predestinarian” views:

- 1) “The election of the good and the reprobation of sinners is determined by God’s decree and not by people’s behavior.” In other words, according to the author, God’s predestination does violence to people’s free will. Barcos remarks that this was precisely what the Semipelagians accused Augustine of: “Free will is nothing in man; it is God’s predestination that is operative in all men, whether for good or for evil” (*Prosper’s Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Gallorum calumniantium*, 6).
- 2) “If one who is predestined to evil wanted to do good, he could not do it. Conversely, one who is predestined to do good will be good regardless of his own will.” The Semipelagian Faustus said that this view of the “predestinarians” contradicts what Jesus said in Matt 7:7-8, by suggesting that some who ask will not be answered and to some who knock the door will not be opened. In his *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Vincentianarum*, 14, Prosper reproduced what Semipelagians were accusing Augustine of saying: “The great number among the Christians who are now Catholic, faithful, just and holy, and who are predestined to fall and be eternally lost, will not obtain the grace of perseverance, even if they beg God for it, because the divine predestination which preordained, prepared, predisposed them to fall into sin is an immutable decree.”
- 3) “The water of Baptism does not wash away all sins.” Pelagians, remarks Barcos, used to accuse Augustine of implying this; however, Augustine merely claimed that concupiscence remains in the baptized as a consequence of original sin. Pelagians, on the contrary, saw concupiscence as a natural good thing, given to us by God to propagate the species.
- 4) “Grace precedes free will to such a degree that man receives before asking, finds before seeking and is opened to him before he knocks.” Prosper, in his letter to Augustine, addressed this concern raised by Semipelagians: “They claim that we can attain this grace, by which we are reborn in Christ, through a natural ability, as a result of our seeking, asking and knocking.”
- 5) Faustus devoted an entire chapter of his work (*De gratia et libero arbitrio* 2,17) to the exegesis of “no one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draw him” (Jn 6:44). Faustus argued that the “predestinarian” understanding of divine grace does violence to the human free will. Pelagians argued

teachings of Augustine and of his followers without directly and openly criticizing their views. By conjuring up the existence of a “predestinarian” sect, the author was able to take issue with the orthodox views on divine grace and predestination that had been upheld by Augustine, defended by his followers, and confirmed by the Church in various papal and conciliar statements.

Barcos goes on to make seven main points:

- 1) To argue that God destroys freedom and that he unfairly changes the will of human beings is groundless. Instead, grace does make willing people out of those who are unwilling (*volentes ex nolentibus facit*). This view is supported by: a) liturgical prayers of the church (e.g., *ad te nostras etiam rebelles compelle propitious voluntates*, found in the Gelasian sacramentary); and b) scriptural passages such as Ez 11:19–21; Phil 2:13; and 2 Cor 3:5.
- 2) The criticism leveled against the “predestinarians” for their particularistic reading of the word “all” in 1 Tim 2:14 is really aimed at Augustine and his disciples, since they upheld it in no uncertain terms in several of their works (see for instance Augustine’s *Ep 217 ad Vitalem* and Prosper’s *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Vincentianorum*, 7, 8).<sup>73</sup>
- 3) To reject the view that “Jesus Christ did not die for all” is an implicit attack on Augustine’s and Prosper’s views. Prosper had to correct the Semipelagian distortion of Augustine’s views on the matter: “The Savior was not crucified for the redemption of the entire world” (*Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Gallorum calumniantium*, 9); and “Our Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer for the salvation and redemption of all men” (*Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Vincentianorum*, 1).
- 4) “Predestinarians” are reproached for believing in a closed number of saved/lost, which is not liable to change. To support this contention, Semipelagians accused “Predestinarians” of teaching that “because of God’s predestination, or rather because of a fatal necessity, people are forced to sin and to go to eternal damnation.”
- 5) “Predestinarians” are accused of following the opinion of the “astrologers” and of the Manicheans, who denied the freedom of the will. Barcos objects: how

---

that Augustine introduced a fatal necessity under the name of “grace.” However, Barcos remarks, all Augustine ever did was to teach that God’s grace precedes people’s merits and wills, and is distributed according to his mercy and justice.

- 6) “To say, as predestinarians do, that we are saved in hope, nullifies the effect of baptism.” Julian upheld such view against Augustine. Augustine retorted that remission of sins/justification of sinners is fully accomplished in this world (*pace* the Pelagians), but fully attained only at the Last Judgment. Obviously, this does not mean that baptism does not remit sins: it does indeed, though its effects (i.e., concupiscence) remain. The Pelagians saw nothing wrong with concupiscence, but Augustine notoriously did.
- 7) “Adam’s sin and its consequences have more power to hurt human beings than the Redemption accomplished by Jesus and the holiness of baptism have to heal them.”
- 73 Prosper’s texts read: “It is the will of God that a great number of Christians have neither the desire nor the possibility of being saved”; and “God does not wish all Catholics to persevere in the faith, but wants a great number of them to apostatize.” After naming these accusations leveled against Augustine’s teachings, Prosper proceeded to rebuff them.

could Fr. Sirmond, who published the *Praedestinatus*, ignore that this was one of the objections raised against Augustine by Pelagians such as Julian, as well as by Semipelagians?

- 6) The anonymous author introduced the idea that God has bestowed a general, sufficient grace to everybody, thanks to which people can become accepted by God and welcomed into his kingdom, if only they embrace it and accept it. Faustus too promoted this view (*De gratia et libero arbitrio* 2,16), saying that “It is truly impious to claim that the grace of God is not offered to everybody and that it does not inspire everybody.” However, Augustine had suggested that God does not give his grace to everybody. To those he gives it, he does so gratuitously, out of his mercy. To those he does not give it, he does so with right cause. Fulgentius too, in his *Epistola 15*, also known as *Epistola synodica*, rejected the view of a “universal grace,” given to everybody. Again, Barcos concludes that the “Predestinarians” targeted by the anonymous author were none other than Augustine and his disciples.
- 7) “Predestinarians” are accused of saying that human free will has completely been lost. Augustine claimed that human beings as a result of the Fall have lost the ability to love God and to do good; however, they are always free and able to do what is wrong. This view was also upheld by the Second Council of Orange (AD 529): “What has been *lost* [emphasis mine] cannot be restored other than by the one who was able to bestow it in the first place (canon 13).”

In Chapter Four (pp. 50–66), “Evaluation of the book that this author claims was written by the Predestinarians under the name of St Augustine,” Barcos takes issue with the second book of the *Praedestinatus*, which was written by the anonymous author himself and trumped by him as a newly discovered text written under the guise of St Augustine by members of a secretive “predestinarian sect.” First, the style, the expressions and the terms found in this second book are so similar to those found in books one and three, so as to leave no doubts as to its common authorship. Secondly, this book is a slanderous libel against the reputation and faith of St Augustine. Barcos quips: why would Sirmond be an advocate and ardent supporter of a Semipelagian author? He wrote: “I think that Fr. Sirmond and all those who support the anonymous author of the *Praedestinatus* should go at great length to explain such a paradox to reasonable people.”<sup>74</sup> Thirdly, Pope Celestine, in his letter to Gallic bishops, imposed silence to Semipelagians who were disrespectful of Augustine’s views; moreover, he did not censor “predestinarians,” as Sirmond, who follows Arnobius’, Hincmar’s, Flooard’s and Sigebert’s views on the matter, would have us believe. Barcos claims:

Fr. Sirmond believes that the enemies of St Augustine, who started the heresy of the predestinarians, were the enemies denounced by St Prosper, who accused them of misunderstanding the teachings of St Augustine. However, it is clear that those people mentioned by Prosper were those Gallic Semipelagians who had

---

<sup>74</sup> Auvray (1644), 55.

accused Augustine of corrupting the Church's doctrine by teaching the very errors and blasphemies which he himself had refuted in a work of his.<sup>75</sup>

After pointing out that Gennadius of Marseilles (labelled as a Semipelagian) in his *Indiculus* omitted mentioning the Semipelagians but listed "Predestinarians" as the penultimate heresy, Barcos notes that Isidore of Seville set the record straight by cancelling Gennadius' last entry. Indignant about the anonymous author's hypocrisy, Barcos remarks that his book is "filled with so many ignorant and false statements as not to deserve not only to be refuted, but even to be read in the first place."<sup>76</sup> Barcos believed that two more arguments can be adduced against the claims of the author of the *Praedestinatus* concerning the existence of a predestinarian sect. First, why did no other ecclesiastical author write at length about this alleged sect? Second, why did the Conclusion of the Second Council of Orange say: "That some have been predestined by the will of God to do evil, not only we do not believe, but moreover, *if there are indeed some people who want to believe something so evil* [emphasis mine], we detest and condemn them." This hypothetical statement ("if there are indeed some people"), does not appear corroborate the anonymous author's story.

In Chapter Five (pp. 67–73), entitled "Conclusion and recapitulation of what has been said so far," Barcos suggests that the "barbarous style" of the anonymous author's Latin, his thoughts and ways of reasoning, seem to belong more to Hincmar's century than to the fifth century; any and all references to fifth century events found in the text should therefore be seen as literary devices to trick the readers into thinking the *Praedestinatus* belonged to an earlier time. As far as Sirmond's publication of this text is concerned, Barcos remarks that it neatly fits into the Society of Jesus' strategy to discredit the two "incomparable bishops" (i.e., Augustine and Jansenius), since it both represents a disguised assault on both Augustinian theology and Jansenius' earlier critique of the claim that there once was a "predestinarian sect." Barcos quips that Sirmond's work should be called *Reprobatus* rather than *Praedestinatus*, because "it contains so many propositions and errors condemned not only by the Church, but also by common sense. Moreover, it discredits both those who use it as a valuable resource as well as the cause which they fight for."<sup>77</sup>

### ***A Vindication of Hincmar's Claims in Sirmond's Historia praedestinatiana (1648)***

After Jansenius criticized in his *Augustinus* the belief that a predestinarian heresy really existed, supported in this claim by Martin Barcos, Sirmond, who had become involved in the rising anti-Jansenist polemics led by his order on the topics of God's grace and predestination, articulated his views in *Historia praedestinatiana* (1648),<sup>78</sup> a ninety pages essay, in which he argued that Archbishop Hincmar was justified in

75 Auvray (1644), 54.

76 Auvray (1644), 60.

77 Auvray (1644), 73.

78 Sirmond (1648).

his belief about the existence of an ancient “predestinarian heresy” – a heresy the monk Gottschalk allegedly contributed to revive.

Sirmond, taking his clues from Hincmar, claimed that the “predestinarian heresy” first originated in the northern African monastery of Hadrumetum out of the misunderstood words of Augustine (i.e., his *Epistola 104* to Sixtus). According to Sirmond, some of the monks living in Hadrumetum, after reading Augustine’s text, began to deny the existence of human free will and to argue against those who rose to its defense. At that point, Augustine wrote two books, allegedly to stigmatize these monks’ error (i.e., *De gratia et libero arbitrio* and *De correptione et gratia*). In these books Augustine taught that human free will did not become extinguished after the Fall, but rather, that it was “wounded” (*sauciata*); and that the human will is not suppressed by God’s grace, but rather healed. In the words of Augustine: “But because there are some who defend the grace of God so that they deny the free choice of human beings or who think that free choice is denied when grace is defended, I have undertaken to write something on this topic.”<sup>79</sup>

Around 429, the heresy of the Predestinarians (who were still not known by that name), spread to Gaul and reached the monasteries of Provence. Prosper and Hilary wrote to Augustine, pleading for help in clarifying some theological issues. As Prosper related to Augustine: “All effort is removed and all the virtues are destroyed if God’s decision comes before human willing. Under this term ‘predestination’ a necessity to fate is introduced” (*Epistula Prospaci ad Augustinum*, 3). In response to his friends’ queries, Augustine wrote *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De bono perseverantiae*. Moreover, according to Sirmond, “virtually all” of Prosper’s *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula objectionum Gallorum calumniantium* were written to rebuff the claims made by the Gallic predestinarians.

Hincmar, in his letter to Pope Nicholas, in regard to the origin of the “predestinarian heresy,” claimed that Pope Celestine, in his letter to the Gallic bishops, disapproved of the “undisciplined questions” that Prosper had mentioned to Augustine, and which he later addressed in his *Objectiones*. Sirmond went on to quote patriarch Photius: “After Augustine’s death, some members of the clergy began to uphold this impious dogma and to defame Augustine, as if he upheld the death of free will. But Pope Celestine squashed this emerging error.”<sup>80</sup>

Sirmond said that the first person to mention the “predestinarian heresy” was the anonymous author of the book known as *Praedestinatus* (i.e., Arnobius the Younger), a copy of which he discovered in the library of the cathedral of St Mary in Reims. In the first part of his work, the anonymous author wrote a catalogue of all heresies and described the ninetieth heresy as the “Predestinarian heresy.”

The ninetieth heresy, which in my Preface I said was falsely attributed to the name of bishop Augustine, took the name of Predestinationists. These people claim that the election of good people and the rejection of evil ones is up to God’s decision

79 Augustine, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* 1, 1. See Teske (1999).

80 Sirmond (1648), 19.

and not to that of human beings, whether they are diligent or negligent. They deny that God's laws are observed by those who attend to them and violated by those who ignore them. They are used to say: "Anyone who has been predestined by God unto evil, even if they wanted to do what is good, they will not be able to reach it. On the other hand, anyone who has been predestined to good, even if they become negligent, they will be led to the good against their own will." They claim that the water of baptism does not wash away all sins. They say: "God's grace precedes free will in such a way that a person who requests it receives it beforehand; a person who seeks it finds it beforehand; and to a person who knocks, the door will be opened beforehand." They say that no one can come to faith in Christ unless they were drawn against their own will by the Father, as they quote that scriptural verse: "No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draw him." They claim that all things are attained not in reality but in hope, so that they apply this saying of the apostle Paul: "Now hope that sees for itself is not hope," even to the sacred mysteries and thus say: "Those things that are seen, appear to be something, but they are not really so." They argue: "Adam was more harmful to humankind than Christ was beneficial to it by coming to its aid. In fact, [the consequences of] what was harmful to humankind [i.e., original sin] remains in us so that neither Christ's Passion, nor the sanctification brought by baptism is able to remove it."<sup>81</sup>

In the second part of his book, the anonymous author made public a text which the predestinarians claimed was written by Augustine himself, which he then proceeded to refute in the third and final part, in painstaking detail. Sirmond argued that book 2 of *Praedestinatus*, which virtually all scholars today agree was written by the same person who composed Book 1 and 3, was an authentic manifesto of the predestinarian sect.

Sirmond found yet another writer who mentioned the "predestinarian heresy." In the *Chronicum alterum*, or *Pseudo-Chronicum*, a brief chronology of events between death of emperor Valens (AD 378) and the sack of Rome by Genseric, the king of the Vandals (AD 455), we find the following entry, under the twenty-third year of Theodosius II's rule (i.e., AD 427): "The predestinarian heresy, which is said to have originated from a misunderstanding of Augustine's works, began to slowly crawl forward around this time."<sup>82</sup> Authorship of this *Chronicle* has been attributed to Prosper, a homonymous contemporary of Prosper of Aquitaine. The *Chronicle* was published by Petrus Pitheus (d. 1596), a French lawyer and a scholar, and by Jacobus Oiselius (d. 1686), in whose version we find this slightly variant: "The predestinarian heresy, which is said to have originated from Augustine, began to crawl forward around this time."

Turning to Gennadius, Sirmond claimed that he created an uproar and "shock waves" among the "new defenders of the ancient error" (i.e., the Jansenists), who did not leave a stone unturned in an attempt to discredit his faith and theological competence, going as far as branding him a "Semipelagian." Jansenius, for instance,

---

<sup>81</sup> See p. 127 below.

<sup>82</sup> See Prosper, *Chronicum alterum sive Pseudochronicum*.

claimed that Gennadius was the first person to mention the “*praedestinati*,” but this is false, argues Sirmond, considering that both Prosper in his *Chronicle* and Arnobius in his *Praedestinatus* had already done that. In reference to Jansenius’ reproach leveled against Gennadius for failing to mention the Pelagians as a heretical sect, Sirmond made the following points:

- a) In another work of his, *De viris illustribus*, 43, Gennadius did not mince his words: “Pelagius the heresiarch, before he was proclaimed a heretic, wrote works of practical value for students: three books *On belief in the Trinity*, and one book of *Selections from Holy Scriptures* bearing on the Christian life. This latter was preceded by tables of contents, after the model of Saint Cyprian the martyr. After he was proclaimed heretic, however, he wrote works bearing on his heresy.”
- b) Gennadius omitted the Pelagians because Augustine in his *De haeresibus* had already mentioned them.
- c) Isidore did not include the “predestinarians” in his catalogue of heresies simply because he failed to read Gennadius and not because he had an axe to grind against this “Semipelagian” author. Thus, Jansenius’ claim that Isidore edited Gennadius, is both “ridiculous and off track” (*nugae itaque fallaces et ridiculae sunt istae*).<sup>83</sup>

According to Sirmond, the struggle against the predestinarian heresy took yet another turn in the confrontation involving a member of this sect, the presbyter Lucidus, and bishop Faustus of Riez. Sirmond reminded his readers that we have a letter written by Faustus to Lucidus dating from that time, namely a prepared self-critical statement for Lucidus to be recited at the Council of Arles (AD 473), in which his views were condemned; and, finally, the work in two books, entitled *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, which Faustus wrote for bishop Leontium, who presided at the Council of Arles. In his letter to Lucidus, which Hincmar quoted verbatim, Faustus is encouraging his interlocutor to “*sentire cum catholica ecclesia*” and to follow the “*regia via*” on matters of grace and free will. Faustus openly condemns the view that God’s foreknowledge is the cause of some people’s damnation; that Christ did not die for all and that he does not want everybody to be saved; and that the gift of grace somehow excludes our participation when we do what is good. These claims stem from ignorance; but to stubbornly hold on to them (*si pertinaciter defendatur*) is blasphemy. In the preface of his book, Faustus identified the predestinarians as those who claim that some people are drawn to eternal life while others are forced to be damned merely on account of God’s will (*per solam dei voluntatem*). Thereby, “they uphold belief in Fate, together with pagan philosophers, and deny free will, together with Manicheans.”<sup>84</sup>

Sirmond also added that Faustus was a very learned and holy man, on account of which two doctors of Theology from the faculty of Louvain (i.e., Driedo and Tapper) did not hesitate to regard him as a Doctor of the Church.<sup>85</sup> Even though Faustus was incorrect about what he wrote concerning the *initium fidei*, it should not

---

<sup>83</sup> Sirmond (1648), 41.

<sup>84</sup> Sirmond (1648), 56.

<sup>85</sup> Sirmond (1648), 61.

be held against him since the Church at that time had not yet spoken authoritatively on the matter. Thus, the Jansenists are wrong for regarding him as a heretic, since they forget that Popes Hormisdas and Gelasius did not call his books “heretical,” but “apocryphal.” According to Sirmond, the main accomplishment of the synod of Orange (AD 529) was not just to correct erroneous opinions which Prosper had called “*reliquiae Pelagianorum*” and which later on will be called “Semipelagian” (even though their supporters were neither Pelagians nor sympathizers of the Pelagian cause), but rather the condemnation contained in canon twenty-five: “Orange II needs to be included rightly and without objections among the synods that condemned the heresy of the Predestinarians.”<sup>86</sup>

The last witness Sirmond introduced to his readers was Ennodius, bishop of Ticinus. In his letter to a certain Constantius, without mentioning by name the predestinarians, Ennodius criticized those who say that human beings’ free will can only produce evil deeds. Calling this view “schismatic,” Ennodius questions whether such will could be called “free,” after all.<sup>87</sup>

In the last two chapters of his essay, Sirmond claimed that Gottschalk revived the predestinarian heresy, just as Rabanus Maurus and Hincmar suggested. Condemned at the councils of Mainz and Quierzy, Gottschalk was ordered to cease any and all talk or writing about predestination. Hincmar wrote: “The modern day predestinarians change color but still retain the same smell and taste. For they say: ‘God predestined the reprobates to destruction, but not to sin, since they deserve reprobation on account of their sins.’”<sup>88</sup>

After this long excursus in which I have attempted to articulate the views of the participants involved in this quarrel over grace and predestination in which this text was a significant element, let the readers now engage the *Praedestinatus* with open minds and form their opinions about it for themselves.

---

<sup>86</sup> Sirmond (1648), 68, 69.

<sup>87</sup> Sirmond (1648), 69, 70.

<sup>88</sup> Sirmond (1648), 88.



## Text and Translation

## CAPITULA

Incipiunt capitula de heresibus numero nonaginta

- I. Simoniana a Simone mago.
- II. Menandrianorum a Menandro.
- III. Basilidianorum a Basilide.
- IV. Nicolaitarum a Nicolao, qui propter pulchram coniugem predicabat  
debere sacerdotes coniuges suas uti.
- V. Saturnianorum a Saturnio.
- VI. Gnosticorum propter scientiam.
- VII. Carpocratianorum a Carpocrate.
- VIII. Cerinthianorum a Cerintho.
- VIII. Nazarenorum a Nazareo.
- X. Hebionei.
- XI. Valentianorum a Valentino.
- XII. Euandrianorum.
- XIII. Ptolemeitae a Ptolemeo Valentini discipuli.
- XIII. a Marco quodam est adinuenta.
- XV. Colobrasiana a Colobrasio.
- XVI. Heracleonitarum ab Heracleone.
- XVII. Ophitarum a colubro nominati sunt.
- XVIII. Cainiti pro hoc quod Cain adorant.
- XVIII. Setianorum propter Seth filium Adae.
- XX. Apud Cretam Archonticorum.
- XXI. a Marcione orta est.
- XXII. Apellitarum est.
- XXIII. Cerdonianorum a Cerdone coepit exordium.
- XXIII. Seuerianorum a Seueriano.
- XXV. Tatianorum a Tatiano.
- XXVI. Cataphryges orti sunt.
- XXVII. Pepuzianorum a loco.
- XXVIII. Artotyritas.
- XXIX. Tesserescedecatitiae dicuntur.
- XXX. Alogiorum.
- XXXI. Adamianorum qui ex Adam nomen acceperunt.
- XXXII. Helceseorum.
- XXXIII. Theodotianorum a Theodoto.
- XXXIII. Melchisedechiani.
- XXXV. Bardesanitae a Bardesane.
- XXXVI. Noetorum est.
- XXXVII. Valesii.
- XXXVIII. Catharoi a munditia.
- XXXVIII. Angelicorum qui se angelicos uoluerunt uocari.
- XL. Apostoliorum.
- XLI. Sabelliana a Sabellio.

HEADINGS<sup>(a)</sup>  
Here Begin the Headings of Ninety Heresies

1. The Simonian heresy, from Simon Magus.
2. The heresy of the Menandrians from Menander.
3. The heresy of the Basilidians from Basilides.
4. The heresy of the Nicolaites from Nicholas, who, because of his beautiful wife, taught the priests must engage their wives in sexual intercourse.
5. The heresy of the Saturnines from Saturninus.
6. The heresy of the Gnostics, so-called after knowledge.
7. The heresy of the Carpocratians from Carpocrates.
8. The heresy of the Cerinthians from Cerinthus.
9. The heresy of the Nazoreans from Nazareo. [no such person existed]
10. The Ebionites.
11. The heresy of the Valentinians from Valentinus.
12. The Evandrians.
13. The Ptolemaites from Ptolemy, a disciple of Valentinus'.
14. The heresy invented by a certain Marcus.
15. The Colorbasian heresy from Colorbasius.
16. The heresy of the Heracleonites from Heracleon.
17. The heresy of the Ophites were named after (the Greek word for) serpent.
18. The Cainites were so-called insofar as they honored Cain.
19. The heresy of the Sethians who were so called after Seth, who was Adam's son.
20. The heresy of the Archontes arose near Crete.
21. The heresy that arose from Marcion.
22. The heresy of the Apellites.
23. The heresy of the Cerdonians originated with Cerdö.
24. The heresy of the Severians from Severus.
25. The heresy of the Tatians from Tatian.
26. The Cataphrygians originated (from their province).
27. The heresy of the Peputians got its name from a certain location.
28. The Artotyrites.
29. The so-called Tesseradecatites.
30. The heresy of the Alogi.
31. The heresy of the Adamites who took their name from Adam.
32. The heresy of the Elcesei.
33. The heresy of the Theodotians.
34. The Melkisedekians.
35. The Bardaisanites.
36. The heresy of the Noetians.
37. The Valesii.
38. The Cathars who claimed to be uncontaminated.
39. The heresy of the Angelici who wanted to be called after angels.
40. The heresy of the Apostolici.
41. The Sabellian heresy from Sabellius.

XLII. Origeniani ab Origene sunt, non ille qui omnibus notus est.

XLIII. Alii Origeniani continuo subsecuti.

XLIV. Paulinianorum a Paulo Samosateo.

XLV. Photinianorum a Photino.

XLVI. Manichei a contubernio Manicheorum.

XLVII. Hieracha Hierachitas.

XLVIII. Meletianorum a Meletio.

XLIX. Arriana ab Arrio.

L. Audianorum.

LI. Eunomianorum ab Eunomio.

LII. Macedonianorum a Macedonio.

LIII. Aerianorum ab Aeriano.

LIV. Aetiana ab Aetio.

LV. Apollinaristarum ab Apollinare.

LVI. Antidicomarianitae.

LVII. Messalianorum.

LVIII. Metangismonitae.

LIX. Seleuciani a Seleucio.

LX. Proclinianistae a Proclino.

LXI. Patriciani a Patricio.

LXII. Ascitarum.

LXIII. Passalorinchitae qui dactylorinchitae.

LXIV. Aquariorum.

LXV. Colutanorum a Colutano.

LXVI. Florianorum a Floriano.

LXVII. Satannianorum a Satannio.

LXVIII. Gymnopodarum.

LXIX. Donatiscae a Donato.

LXX. Priscillianorum a Priscilliano Hispaniae.

LXXI. Adelophagi.

LXXII. Rhetoriani a Rhetorio.

LXXIII. Theoponitarum.

LXXIV. Trissolitae.

LXXV. Hydrotheitae.

LXXVI. Homuncionitae.

LXXVII. Ametritae.

LXXVIII. Psycopneumones.

LXXIX. Adicerditae.

LXXX. Haeresis ista a quo exorta est nomen non habet, sed hoc dicit filium dei postea genitum posteaquam uoluit pater.

LXXXI. Luciferianus a Lucifero.

LXXXII. louinianistae a louiniano.

LXXXIII. Arabicos ab arabici, qui auctorem non habent.

42. The Origenians derived their name from Origen, but not the one who is well known.
43. Other Origenians who came after the previous ones.
44. The heresy of the Paulicians from Paul of Samosata.
45. The heresy of the Photinians from Photinus.
46. The Manichei from the fellowship of the Manicheans.
47. The Hierachites from Hieracha.
48. The Meletians from Meletius.
49. The Arian heresy from Arius.
50. The heresy of the Audians.
51. The heresy of the Eunomians from Eunomius.
52. The heresy of the Macedonians from Macedonius.
53. The heresy of the Aerians from Aerianus.
54. The Aetiana heresy from Aetius.
55. The heresy of the Apollinarists from Apollinaris.
56. The Antidicomarites.
57. The heresy of the Messalians.
58. The Metangismonites.
59. The Seleucians from Seleucus.
60. The Proclinianites from Proclinus.
61. The Patricians from Patricius.
62. The heresy of the Ascites.
63. The Passalorynchites who are the Dactilorinchites.
64. The heresy of the Aquarians.
65. The heresy of the Colluthians from Colluthus.
66. The heresy of the Floriani from Florianus.
67. The heresy of the Satanniaci from Satannius.
68. The heresy of the Gymnopedies.
69. The Donatists from Donatus.
70. The heresy of the Priscillianists from the Spaniard Priscillian.
71. The Adelophagi
72. The Rhetoriani from Rhetorius.
73. The heresy of the Theoponites.
74. The Triscilidae.
75. The Hydrotheits.
76. The Homuncionites.
77. The Ametrites.
78. The Psychopneumones.
79. The Adecerdites.
80. This heresy which arose from someone does not have a name, though it claims that the Son of God became Son after being born, in accordance with the Father's will.
81. The Luciferians from Lucifer.
82. The Jovianists from Jovinianus.
83. The heresy of the Arabs, which does not have a founder.

LXXXIII.	Heluidianorum ab Heluidiano.
LXXXV.	Paterniani.
LXXXVI.	Tertullianistas.
LXXXVII.	Abelitas ab Abel.
LXXXVIII.	Pelagianistae a Pelagio.
LXXXVIII.	Nestoriani a Nestorio.
XC.	Praedestinotorum.

Expliciunt capitula XC numero de heresibus

Incipiunt capitula quae heretici in libro praedestinotorum defendunt

- I. Estote securi de ordinatione dei, quam praedestinando constituit. *Cui uult deus miseretur et quem uult obdurat. Non est uolentis neque currentis, sed miserentis est dei. Potestatem habet figurulus lutu ex eadem massa unum facere uas ad honorem aliud ad contumeliam, ut non quae uultis ipsa illa faciat. Iam praedestinavit deus quos praesciit et quos iustificauit hos et magnificauit. Non est in homine uia eius et cetera.*
- II. Per praescientiam deus praedestinationem suam constituit. Iam quos praesciit nullo modo conuerti, hos praedestinavit ad mortem et quos praesciit omnimodo conuerti, hos praedestinavit ad uitam.
- III. De hoc quod apostolus dicit: *uasa apta irae in interitum.*
- IV. De hoc quod scriptum est: *Iacob dilexi, Esau autem odio habui.*
- V. De hoc quod euangelizauit apostolus dicens: *quos uocauit hos praedestinavit.*
- VI. Praedestinavit deus homines siue ad iustitiam siue ad peccatum, et idcirco quod eos uoluit esse qui condidit, aliud esse non posse.
- VII. Quia dixit apostolus: *quos praedestinavit hos et uocauit.*
- VIII. De Iuda praedestinato ad perditionem et Saulum ad uitam.
- IX. Hos deum saluare et hos praedestinavit ad salutem quos scit dignos salute redemtionis sua, et hos tantum saluare quos semel ad salutem praedestinas cognoscit. Et de hoc quod dicent quia non antecedit arbitrii libertas gratiam dei, sed antecedit gratia dei libertatem arbitrii.

84. The Elvidians from Elvidius.
85. The Paternians.
86. The Tertullianists.
87. The Abelites take their name from Abel.
88. The Pelagians from Pelagius.
89. The Nestorians from Nestorius.
90. The heresy of the Predestinarians.

Here end the ninety chapters of the heresies.

#### Index of the Headings which the Predestinarian Heretics Uphold in their Book

1. Be confident about God's providential arrangement which he has established by means of predestination. *God has mercy upon whom he wills, and he hardens whom he wills.*<sup>1</sup> *It depends not upon a person's will or exertion, but upon God, who shows mercy.*<sup>2</sup> *The potter has a right over the clay, to make out of the same lump one vessel for a noble purpose and another for an ignoble one,*<sup>3</sup> *so that you may not do what you want.*<sup>4</sup> *God already predestined those he foreknew and those whom he justified he also glorified.*<sup>5</sup> *No one chooses their way,*<sup>6</sup> etc.
2. God already established predestination through his own foreknowledge. Those whom he already foreknew would not be converted in any away he predestined to death; those whom he foreknew would be converted in various ways he predestined to life.
3. Concerning what the apostle said: *vessels of wrath made for destruction.*<sup>7</sup>
4. Concerning what is written: *I loved Jacob, but hated Esau.*<sup>8</sup>
5. Concerning what the apostle Paul announced by saying: *Those whom God called, he also predestined.*<sup>9</sup>
6. God predestined human beings either to justice or to sin, and therefore those whom the Creator wanted to be a certain way cannot be otherwise.
7. Why the Apostle said: *Those whom God predestined he also called.*<sup>10</sup>
8. The predestination of Judas to perdition and of Saul to eternal life.
9. All those whom God knew are worthy of the salvation issuing from his redemption, he predestined to salvation; thus, God saves only those people whom he knows he had predestined to salvation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rom 9:18.

<sup>2</sup> Rom 9:16.

<sup>3</sup> Rom 9:21.

<sup>4</sup> Gal 5:17.

<sup>5</sup> Rom 8:29-30.

<sup>6</sup> Jer 10:23.

<sup>7</sup> Rom 9:22.

<sup>8</sup> Rom 9:13.

<sup>9</sup> Rom 8:30.

<sup>10</sup> Rom 8:30.

X. Vanam et infructuosam esse hominis uoluntatem et arbitrium.

XI. De hoc quod in euangelio *nemo uenit ad me nisi quem pater attraxerit.*

XII. De hoc quod dicit apostolus: *non est uolentis neque currentis, sed miserentis est dei.*

XIII. De hoc quod scriptum est: *nisi dominus aedificauerit domum in uanum laborauerunt qui aedificant eam. Nisi dominus custodierit ciuitatem in uanum uigilauerunt qui custodiunt eam.*

XIII. Quia dicent: aedificatio hominis non est certa, sed uana.

XV. De hoc quod idem supra: *nisi dominus aedificauerit domum, nisi dominus custodierit ciuitatem.*

XVI. De hoc quod de semetipso apostolus dicit: *non quod uolo bonum hoc facio, sed quod nolo malum illud facio.*

XVII. De hoc quod dicit: non uocantur nisi praedestinati. Antecedit enim gratia dei hominis voluntatem. Prior est enim deus in bono hominis, homo autem in omni bono uix nouissimus inuenitur.

XVIII. Ergo homo uincit deum, si deus eum uult esse bonum, et bonus non est.

XVIII. De hoc quod dicent in libro suo: antecedit gratia dei hominis uoluntatem.

XX. Item dicunt in eodem libro praecedere uoluntatem hominis dei uoluntatem.

XXI. De apostolo: non enim cum rogaremus neque cum peteremus, sed *cum inimici essemus, reconciliati sumus*, non per nostram uoluntatem, sed *per mortem filii eius.*

XXII. Dicit enim liber eorum quod *omnes* non debent intellegi omnes.

XXIII. Et hoc dicent hominis uoluntate nihil sibi prodesse posse.

XXIII. Dicit liber eorum eo quod per *praeuaricationem* primi hominis periisse ab hominibus arbitrii libertatem.

XXV. Dicente libro eorum Pelagianam haeresem renouari propter arbitrii libertatem.

XXVI. De gratia et libertate arbitrii.

XXVII. De gratia quod uni se tenuem exhibeat, alii uero abundantem et largam non prout nos uolumus, sed prout ipse uult.

10. Human beings' will and freedom of choice are vain and fruitless.
11. Concerning what we read in the Gospel: *No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draw him.*<sup>11</sup>
12. Concerning what the apostle Paul said: *So it depends not upon a person's will or exertion, but upon God, who shows mercy.*<sup>12</sup>
13. Concerning what we read in Scripture: *Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build. Unless the Lord guard the city, in vain does the guard keep watch.*<sup>13</sup>
14. Why they say: the edification of human beings is not certain but in vain.
15. Concerning what has been said before: *Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build. Unless the Lord guard the city.*<sup>14</sup>
16. Concerning what the apostle himself said: I do not do the good I want, but I do the evil I do not want.<sup>15</sup>
17. Concerning what is said: "they are not called unless they are predestined." For the grace of God preceded the human will. In fact, God comes first in the good that human beings do. Human beings are hardly ever found to be the first in the good that they do.
18. Therefore, God would be defeated by human beings if he wanted a person to be good and they turned out not to be good.
19. Concerning what they say in their book: "The grace of God precedes the human will."
20. Again, what they say in the same book about the human will preceding the grace of God.
21. Concerning the apostle's claim that it is not when we asked or prayed that we were reconciled to God, but rather *when we were still his enemies*, and that did not happen according to the human will, but *through the death of his Son.*<sup>16</sup>
22. Their book claims that the word *all* must not be understood literally as "everyone."<sup>17</sup>
23. They say that nothing stemming from the human will can be beneficial to them.
24. Their book claims that due to the prevarication of the first human beings human free will has become extinguished.
25. They say in their book that the Pelagian heresy is being renewed by upholding free will.
26. Concerning the grace of God and the freedom of the will.
27. Concerning the grace of God: if one seems to have received a small amount of it, while another appears to have gotten a larger amount, is not because they wanted it to be that way, but because God himself did.

---

<sup>11</sup> Jn 6:44.

<sup>12</sup> Rom 9:16.

<sup>13</sup> Ps 126 (127):1.

<sup>14</sup> Ps 126 (127):1.

<sup>15</sup> Rom 7:19

<sup>16</sup> Rom 5:10.

<sup>17</sup> This is a reference to the debate about the meaning of Rom 3:23 as to whether the "all" of *all fall short of the glory of God* should be understood as "all" – a debate found in Book 3,8.

XXVIII. De hoc quod dicit apostolus: *spe salui facti sumus; spes autem quae uidetur non est spes* et cetera.

XXVIII. Post baptismatis gratiam non esse peccati nec possibilitas nec uoluntas.

XXX. Per baptismum tantum tolli peccatum, ut capillum a nouacula rasum, non tamen ut peremundaretur eradicatum.

XXXI. Si darentur quae promittuntur in baptismo, nullus post baptismatis undam concupiscentiae stimulo pungeretur.

XXXII. Concupiscentia de coniugiis celebrandis.

Expliunt capitula.

28. Concerning the words of the apostle Paul: *We have been saved in hope; for the hope that is seen is not hope.*<sup>18</sup>
29. Following the grace of baptism, there is neither the possibility nor the will to sin.
30. Through baptism sin is removed only like a hair is removed when it is shaven off, but not removed at the root.
31. If the things that are promised in baptism were truly given to us, no one would be stung by concupiscence after the baptismal washing.
32. Concupiscence among spouses must be celebrated.

Here end the chapters.

---

<sup>18</sup> Rom 8:24.

## PRAEFATIO

1. Quotiescumque ad te, o amator dei, uerba doctorum attingunt, illico sunt domini praecepta memoranda quibus iubere dignatur ut attendamus ab his qui uenient ad nos in uestitu ouium, ne sub hoc tegmine luporum rabies occultata ouilem simplicitatem inuadat. Vtinam mihi uerbis ista dixisse sufficeret, et non, quod est cum suspirio memorandum, manifestum sit miscuisse se belluas gregi dominico, qui tanta subtilitate clandestino hiatu sese catholicis immerserunt ut ipsi magis ciues sanctorum et domestici fidei aestimentur, qui inimici ecclesiae et hostes dolosissimi comprobantur, dicentes iam homines ita praedestinatos ad mortem per dei praescientiam ut illis nec passio Christi nec baptismatis redemptio nec fides nec spes possit nec caritas subuenire. Orent, et ieuniis et elemosynis occupentur: nulla, inquiunt, poterunt ratione liberari, quia non sunt praedestinati ad uitam. Econtra hi quos praedestinatio praescia futurorum dispunxit, negligant, contemnant et iustitiam fugiant: sic isti etiam nolentes trahuntur ad uitam, sicut illi uolentes ad uitam pertingere expelluntur in mortem. Sic istis non potentibus datur, sicut illis potentibus denegatur. Et isti quidem non quaerentes inuenient, illi autem quaerentes inuenire non possunt. Istis pietatis ianua non pulsantibus reseratur, illis autem nulla ratione poterit, etiam pulsantibus, etiam clamantibus aperiri. Quis hanc fidem habens sacerdotum benedictionibus caput inclinare desideret, et eorum sibi precibus et sacrificiis credat posse succurri? Si enim haec nec prodesse uolentibus, nec obesse nolentibus incipient credi, cessabunt omnia dei sacerdotum studia, et uniuersa monitorum adminicula uana uidebuntur esse figmenta, atque ita unusquisque suis erit uitiis occupatus ut criminum suorum delectationem dei praedestinationem existimet, et ad bonum a malo transitum nec per sacerdotem dei nec per conuersionem suam nec per legem dominicam se posse inuenire confidat.
2. Silerem, fateor, et nequaquam stilo percurrente ista detegarem, si toties ut tacerent admoniti, saltem mediocriter contentionis suae impetum temperassent; non etiam audacter sub Augustini nomine libros ederent, et scriptorum suorum iaculis membra immaculatae matris nostrae ecclesiae uulnerarent.

## PREFACE

1. Dear lover of God, every time you hear the words of our wise teachers, do not hesitate to regard them as the Lord's own instructions we need to be mindful of. By such teachings the Lord saw it fit to exhort us to beware of those who come to us dressed in sheep clothing, so that under this disguise the wolves' hidden rabid fury may not ravage the simplicity of our flock. I wish my warning was good enough, and that it would not be obvious, let me mournfully remind you, that such wolves have already infiltrated the Lord's flock. These wolves have already mingled with the Catholic faithful in a very subtle way by entering the Church through a hidden door, so to speak, being now regarded more as fellow citizens of the saints and servants of the faith rather than being exposed for what they really are, namely as harmful to the Church and her most irreducible enemies. These people claim that [some] human beings have already been predestined to death through God's foreknowledge in such a way that neither the Passion of Christ, nor baptismal redemption, nor faith, hope and charity will be of any help to them. Even if such people prayed, practiced fasting and almsgiving they will not be saved, no matter what, since they have not been predestined to eternal life. Conversely, those people whom God's predestination foreknew would neglect, despise and eschew justice, are drawn to life even against their will, just as those who yearn for eternal life are banished to eternal death. Just as God gives to those who do not knock, he denies to those who ask; and just as these people who do not seek find, those who seek are not able to find. Heaven's door is opened to these people who do not knock, but it cannot be opened to the others, no matter what, even when they knock, even if they cry out. I ask, who having such belief would want to bow their heads to our priests' blessings and really believe that their prayers and sacrifices would help them in any way? In fact, if all these things did not help those who want, nor encourage those who are unwilling so that they may begin to believe, the zeal of God's priests will end and all the various warnings of those who encourage us to lead moral lives will appear to be pointless; consequently, everyone is going to indulge their own vices being fully persuaded that enjoyment of their sins is based on God's predestination and conclude that they are not able to change from sinfulness to virtue, neither through God's priests, nor through their own conversion, or through observance of the divine law.
2. I admit I would have held my peace and would have never exposed these things in writing had these people remained silent after receiving several warnings, or at least toned down to a moderate extent the rhetoric of their claims. At that time they had not yet shamelessly published books under Augustine's name and wounded with the arrows of their writings the members of our immaculate mother, the Church. What son does

Quis filius matrem suam caedi non doleat? Quis genitricem suam uulnerari non plangat? An tacebimus illa laborante? Sed silentium nostrum reatus docebitur, et taciturnitas uidebitur esse consensus. Quam enim tu patientiam taciturnitatis putas, hanc alius conscientiam peruersitatis existimat, praesertim si et ipse taceas, et eum qui loqui uoluerit pro defensione matris communis forsitan silere compellas. Cum tempus tacendi et tempus loquendi in id sapientia diuina instituerit, ut et modestia in silentio, et ratio esset in uerbo, ne ultra honestatis terminum unusquisque linguam uel promeret uel teneret, essetque loquacitas importuna aut taciturnitas obstinata, cum utrumque ueniret in uitium: loqui uelle cum non debeas, et nolle cum debeas. Istud igitur me in alterutrum custodisse habita ratione perdoceo, cum contra librum matri ecclesiae tendentem insidias diuini oris arma corripiam et, ut Goliae, ex suo sibimet gladio, confidens in domino, eius ceruicem abscido. Qui tristis fuerit, suo quasi mus prodetur indicio, cum sui murmure Philistaeum se esse detexerit. Me cum autem gratulabitur omnis qui allophylus non est.

3. Igitur cum sollicite celatur, et occulte legitur, et caute conscribitur, tandem aliquando, non tam editus quam deprehensus, ad manus nostras peruenit liber, qui Augustinum mentitur in titulo, cum se haereticum ostendat in textu. Quis enim nesciat Augustinum orthodoxum semper fuisse doctorem, et tam scribendo quam disputando omnibus haereticis obuiasse? Volentes ergo inimicum fidei nostrae inter fratres dogma inducere, catholicum supra liminare libri sui titulum posuerunt. Qui liber, uelut sepulcrum foetens, a foris quidem Augustini nomine dealbatur, intus uero scaturit uermibus mortuorum. Hunc librum aliquando sibi oblatum beatissimae memoriae summus pontifex Caelestinus ita exsecrationi habuit ut eum perpetuo iuberet damnari silentio. Eo magis haereticorum animus inflammatus, clanculo eum per diuersas domos tradidit lectitandum, quique quanto legi publice uetabatur, tanto ab eis asserebatur insuperabili aequitate conscriptus. Sicque perfidum iniere consilium ut in modum symboli non discutiendus traderetur aliquibus, sed credendus. Ita contra hunc suscepimus ut aduersum singula blasphemiorum eius dicta, tam rationabili ueritate quam legali auctoritate pugnemus. Quem librum non discerpentes, sed integrum eum ab initio usque ad finem praescribentes, nonagesimae haereseos proiecimus siluae, arborem eum nequissimam detegentes, ad cuius radicem securis est posita ad hoc ut excidatur et in ignem mittatur. Vbicunque autem eiusdem libri sunt dicta, lineis a tergo uersuum iacentibus deteguntur. Quae licet pro ipsa sui peruersitate ultro se legentibus

not cry when his mother has been killed? Who does not feel sorrow if his mother has been wounded? Should we remain silent when our mother is in distress? Indeed, our silence would make us guilty and not speaking up about this could be misconstrued as approval on our part. What you may regard as patience shown by remaining silent, another person regards it as awareness of wrongdoing, especially if you yourself remain silent about it and possibly even force to remain quiet the people who wanted to speak out in defense of the mother they have in common. Divine wisdom established what is the proper time to remain silent or to speak up in this matter: this way, modesty would be exhibited in silence and the power of reason be shown in words. This course of action is actually preferable, since it ensures that the nature of honesty will not empower or restrain everyone's tongue beyond its limits and thus render loquacity inopportune or silence obstinate, which is what happens when these things are taken to their excess: in other words, to yearn to speak when you shouldn't and refusing to speak up when you really should. Therefore, I intend to thoroughly show that I have kept myself from falling into either one of these excesses by taking all this into account, as I yield the weapons of God's word against a book that seeks to ensnare mother Church. Thus, trusting God, I cut Goliath's head off using his own sword against him. The author of this book will be sorry, almost like a mouse that leaves behind a trace of its activity, when he is exposed to be a Philistine [i.e., unbeliever] in virtue of his pronouncements. Anyone who is not a stranger to our faith will then rejoice with me.

3. Even though it was carefully kept hidden, secretly read, and cautiously written down, eventually at one point, even though it had not yet acquired notoriety but was rather intercepted, we got hold of a book that imitates Augustine in its title, though it turns out to be heretical in its contents. For who doesn't know that Augustine has always been an orthodox teacher and that he took on all kinds of heretics both in his writings and in his disputes? The people responsible for this book, wanting to introduce an inimical dogma among the brothers of our faith, inscribed a Catholic title on its front. This book, a foul-smelling grave, is whitewashed on the outside with the name of Augustine, but inside it is filled with worms oozing from corpses. Pope Celestine, of most blessed memory, who at one time was offered this book, held it in such contempt that he ordered it to be relegated to perpetual silence. As the heretics responsible for this book were spurned, they became even more enraged and began to secretly circulate it through various homes for people to read; the more it was forbidden to circulate freely, the more they claimed it was written with unsurpassed fairness. Thus, an evil plan was hatched for this book to be handed to everyone as a symbol of faith not to be discussed, but rather as to be firmly believed in. Therefore, we undertook to refute it in each and every individual blasphemous claim that it contains, and to fight against it both with rational and truthful arguments as well as with legal authority. In the process of not picking and choosing parts of this book but rather of addressing it in its entirety, from beginning to end, we cut down the wood of the ninetieth heresy, revealing it to be a most wretched tree, at whose roots an ax has been put in order to destroy it and consign it to the flames. Wherever controversial statements are found in this book, they are exposed for the fraud that they are in the pages that follow. Even though these statements are revealed to the readers to have gone way beyond their own perversity, we have acted in such a way that truth

prodant, tamen egimus ut ueritas a mendacio non solum uerbis rationabilibus, sed etiam alogiis increpantibus discernatur.

4. Sane Graecorum nos legisse catholicorum scripta contra haereticorum sectas dimicantia idcirco memoramus, et omnes haereses singillatim per ordinem, licet strictim, perscribimus ut sciant nouae huius haeresis inuentores omnium nos haereticorum definitionibus aduersari, et nullius eorum contra se uti consensu. Cesset omnis tergiuersatio, et calliditas oblatrantium in modum canis uomitus suos ipsa iterum sorbeat. Omnes a Simone cooptas haereses detegimus, arguimus, condemnamus, et tam ratione quam auctoritate superatas ostendimus. In detectione igitur falsitatis et in defensione ueritatis catholicorum sumus secuti uestigia, et id gessimus ut in primo libro ueterata haereseos superstitiones perpatescat, in secundo uero nouae adinuentio[n]is uenena non lateant, tertius uero liber haereseos deuictae tumulum fideique tropaeum cunctis ecclesiis tradat. Clemens itaque Romanus episcopus, Petri discipulus, Christi dignissimus martyr, Simonis haeresim a Petro apostolo cum ipso Simone superatam edocuit. Hunc secuti sunt sancti quique orthodoxi uiri, et suo quiske tempore uniuscuiusque haeresis ortum et certamen et exitum, per plurimos libros, et multa milia uersuum conscripserunt, quae nos epitomantes, iuuante domino, hoc uno libello conclusimus. Orabunt pro nobis sancta studia, quae ad requiem curarum suarum per hunc nostrum laborem attingunt.

may be distinguished from falsehood non only by means of rational discourse, but also of scornful remarks.

4. Therefore, we remember reading the writings of the Greek fathers arguing against heretical sects and resolved to proceed in an orderly fashion, going through all such sects one by one, though in a concise way, so that proponents of this new heresy may be put on notice that we oppose the beliefs of all heretics and that we do not need to employ the consent of any of them as a proof to be used against them. Let us then not delay, just as the shrewdness of those who bark in such way will show them to be like those dogs who go back to their own vomit. We are going to expose, convict and condemn all the heresies that started with Simon, and will show by reason and authority that they have been overcome. In uncovering falsehood and in defending truth we have followed the footsteps of Catholic authors. We have done this in order that in the first book the ancient superstition of various heresies may be revealed; in the second book, so that the poisons of the new “invention” may not escape notice; finally, in the third book, so that we may deliver as a trophy to the entire Church the rubble of the vanquished heresy. Clement, bishop of Rome, disciple of Peter’s and a most worthy martyr of Christ, expounded the heresy of Simon that had already been vanquished by the Apostle Peter. Many a holy and orthodox people wrote down in many books and described in thousands lines the struggle and outcome of each heresy that arose in their own time; we ourselves, with the Lord’s help, have included them in one book by properly categorizing them. The research conducted by these holy men will speak for us, as we bring them to a fruitful conclusion through our own work.

## LIBER PRIMUS

Incipit epitoma ἐκδικήσεως Hygini contra haeresiarches et categoricorum Epiphanius contra sectas et expositionum Philastrii, qui hos transferens in latinum sermonem de Graeco cum Arriani damnarentur edidit. Prior Hyginus, post hunc Polycrates, Africanus, Hesiodus, Epiphanius, Philaster, hi diuersis temporibus diuersas haereses detexerunt. Incipit epitoma categoricorum.

I. Prima haeresis a Simone sumpsit exordium, qui dicebat castitatem ad deum non pertinere, deum mundum non fecisse. Haec et his similia. A beato et sancto apostolo Petro ita est publice superatus ut ante pedes eius cadens ultra surgere minime potuisset. II. Secunda haeresis a Menandro Menandrianorum, qui mundum non a deo, sed ab angelis factum esse testantur. Hos sanctus Linus episcopus, secundus apostoli Petri, a consortio conuersationis nostrae electos aeterna damnatione multauit, docens rationabiliter secundum sanctas scripturas ueteris testamenti deum qui cum Moyse locutus est, hunc esse omnium creatorem, et nihil in creaturis omnibus esse quod possit pro sui natura esse uituperabile. Omnia enim quae culpabilia iudicantur, actu non conditione culpantur. III. Tertia haeresis a Basilide Basilidianorum. Hi trecentos sexaginta et quinque caelos esse dicentes, contra Moysen suscipiunt, et deum horum caelorum Abrasax commemorant. Quod nomen Graeca ratio litterarum in hanc summam supputando pertingit: ΑΒΡΑΣΑΞ, id est: A unum et B duo et P centum et A unum et Σ ducenti et A unum et Ξ sexaginta fiunt in summa CCCLXV. Hos ecclesia ut energumenos computans, non altercando, sed proiendo damnauit. IV. Quarta Nicolitarum a Nicolao haeresis est adinuenta, qui unus ex septem diaconibus ab apostolis ordinatus est. Iste, cum de zelo pulcherrimae coniugis culparetur, docere coepit indifferenter deberi uti coniugibus, non solum laicis, sed etiam his qui sacerdotii fungerentur officio. Hos damnauit sanctus Iohannes apostolus et euangelista et iussit ut quicumque cum eis uel sermonem colloquii miscuissent, ex hoc ipso communione priuandos, docens rationabiliter a mundi origine deo castitatem plurimum placuisse. Nunc autem etiam in seipso Christum dei

# FIRST BOOK

The first of these researches were: Hyginus' epitome (Ἐκδίκησις) against the heresiarchs; Epiphanius' categorization of various sects; and Philastrius' (a) descriptions of various heresies, who expounded them by translating the Greek fathers' syntagms against them into Latin, so that the Arians would be condemned. First Hyginus, and then after him Polycrates, Africanus, Hesiod, Epiphanius, Philastrius: all these people exposed various heresies at different times. Here begins the summary of heretical categories.

1. The first heresy was originated by Simon, who claimed that God does not value chastity and that he did not create the world: this is what he said, and similar things. He was publicly humiliated by the blessed and holy apostle Peter in such a way that after falling at the latter's feet he could not get up at all.

2. The second heresy of the Menandrians was founded by Menander. They bore witness that the world was not made by God, but by angels. The holy bishop Linus, who succeeded the apostle Peter, having thrown them out of our fellowship, sentenced them to eternal damnation. Linus taught in a rational manner according to the holy scriptures of the Old Testament that the God who spoke with Moses is this creator of all things, and that there is nothing in all creatures that could possibly be blameworthy on account of its own nature. Everything that is considered to be worthy of condemnation is such in virtue of its own actions, and not of its own nature.

3. The third heresy of the Basilidians was founded by Basilides. Claiming that there are three hundred sixty-five heavens, these people reject Moses' teachings and uphold Abrasax as the supreme god of these heavens. They came up with this name by adding up the Greek letters. ABRASAX, namely: A stand for 1; B, for 2; R for 100; A, for 1; S, for 200; A, for 1; and X, for 60. All these numbers add up to three hundred sixty-five. The church, regarding them as possessed by the devil, condemned them not by arguing with them but by expelling them.

4. The fourth heresy of the Nicolaites, was founded by Nicholas, who was one of the seven deacons ordained by the apostles.<sup>1</sup> (b) This man, filled with ardent love for his most beautiful wife, began to teach that sex was to be enjoyed by all couples, not only laypeople, but also by those who exercise the priestly office. The holy apostle and evangelist John condemned them and decreed that anyone who associated with them or even talked to them were *ipso facto* to be deprived of fellowship, as he taught in a rational manner that God had been pleased very much since the foundation of the world with the value of chastity. As a matter of fact, God himself celebrated the

---

<sup>1</sup> Acts 6:1–6.

filium castitatis gloriam dedicasse, cum uirginem possidens matrem, uirgo mansurus, nullum discipulorum suorum commixtionem etiam legitimi coniugii uti permisit, dicens: *si quis uult post me uenire, abneget se ipsum sibi et tollat crucem suam et sequatur me.*

V. Quinta haeresis Saturnianorum est a Saturnino. Hic docuit septem angelos mundum fecisse, quibus cordi fuit libidines inserere ut, dum sese concupiscit ex alterutro diuersitas sexus, mundus a sui fine refrenatus possit esse perpetuus. Hos anathematizauit beatus Thomas Christi apostolus docens rationabiliter mundum initium habuisse, et quia initium habuit, ad finem esse uenturum. Angelos autem omnipotentiam habere non posse et ideo mundum eos non potuisse constituere. Conditorem autem mundi unum esse deum quem Moyses praedicauit fecisse *caelum et terram et mare et omnia quae in eis sunt.*

VI. Sexta haeresis Gnosticorum, qui Gnosticos se appellari uoluerunt, quasi propter scientiam excellentem, cum miseriiores superioribus esse, quos memorauimus, haberentur, docens eos rationabiliter beatus Paulus apostolus non deo seruire, *sed suo uentri* et libidini, inflatos esse et nihil scire et aegrotare circa quaestiones et uerborum pugnas.

VII. Carpocratianorum septima est haeresis a Carpocrate inuenta, qui docebat potestates tenebrarum transire non posse, nisi solos eos qui omni se turpitudini miscuissent. Hi dominum nostrum Iesum de utroque sexu genitum asserebant, sed talem animam accepisse quae superna caelorum sciret. Resurrectionem corporis denegantes, prophetas testamenti ueteris condemnabant. Habebant autem Marcellinam quandam, quae imagines Iesu et Pauli et Pythagorae philosophi ponebat in medio populi quem decipiebat, et faciebat eos his imaginibus honorem deitatis exhibere et incensum ponere. Hos damnauit apud Cyprum beatus Barnabas Christi discipulus docens eos ministros esse Satanae, et non debere constituit Christianum penitus cum his habere sermonem.

VIII. Octaua haeresis Cerinthianorum a Cerintho. Dicebant mundum ab angelis factum, carne circumcidi debere, ueteris testamenti secundum litteram debere pracepta seruari. Iesum hominem tantummodo fuisse, nec resurrexisse, sed adhuc resurrectum esse memorabant. Hos in Galatia aeterno anathemate beatus apostolus Paulus condemnauit. Hos denique tangit in sua epistola quam ad Galatas misit.

IX. Nona haeresis Nazarenorum. Filium quidem dei confitentur, omnem autem ritum ueteris testamenti iudaico more conseruant. Hos docuit beatus apostolus Paulus debere

extolled value of chastity in Christ his Son, as he indwelt a virgin mother and remained in her womb. John also did not allow any of his disciples to enjoy intercourse even with their legitimate spouses, reminding them of what Jesus himself said: *Whoever wishes to come after me must deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me.*<sup>2</sup>

5. The fifth heresy of the Saturnines, stemmed from Saturninus. This man taught that seven angels created the world, and that lust was placed in their hearts so that, as they desired each other due to their different sex, the world would be kept from reaching an end, and thus exist in perpetuity. The blessed Thomas, apostle of Christ, teaching in a rational fashion that the world had a beginning, said that because of that it will eventually come to an end, and that angels did not enjoy omnipotence and therefore could not have created the world. Thus, the creator of the world was the God who Moses taught *made heaven and earth, the seas and all that is contained in them.*<sup>3</sup>

6. The sixth heresy is of the Gnostics, who claimed this name for themselves, almost as if they enjoyed a higher kind of knowledge making them superior to ordinary people. The blessed apostle Paul taught that they did not serve God, but their bellies and lust, and that they were full of themselves and did not really know anything but rather lost themselves in sterile questions and verbal battles.

7. The seventh heresy of the Carpocratians originated with Carpocrates. He taught that it was impossible for anyone to cross over the powers of darkness except for those who got involved with every turpitude. These people claimed that our Lord Jesus was born from intercourse of both parents, but that he received a soul capable of knowing realities of the highest heavens. By denying the reality of bodily resurrection, they condemned the prophets of the Old Testament. A certain Marcellina was a member of their sect; this woman put in the midst of the people whom she deceived various images of Jesus, Paul and the philosopher Pythagoras and paid respect to them as if they were deities, and burned incense in their honor. They were condemned in Cyprus by blessed Barnabas, Jesus's disciple, who claimed that they were ministers of Satan's and declared that no Christian should ever speak with them.

8. The eight heresy is the Cerinthians, and it was founded by Cerinthus. They said that the world had been created by angels, and that males must be circumcised and observe the precepts of the Old Testament to the letter. According to them, Jesus was just a man and that he has not risen from the dead yet, but that he eventually will. The blessed apostle Paul condemned them with an eternal anathema in Galatia; he also briefly referred to them in his letter to the Galatians. (c)

9. The ninth heresy is that of the so-called Nazoreans. They believe in the Son of God but retain every single ritual of the Old Testament according to Jewish custom.

---

<sup>2</sup> Mt 16:24.

<sup>3</sup> See Ex 20:11 (also, cf. Neh 9:6; Ps 145:6; Jer 51:48; 2 Mac 7:28; Act 4:24; and 14:14).

spiritualiter scripturas aduertere, et hos in ecclesiis Galatiae deprehendit atque non consentientes doctrinae suae anathemati esse constituit.

X. Decima haeresis Hebionaei. Hominem solum fuisse dominum Iesum Christum asserunt, et legis mandata more iudaico custodienda constituunt. Hos Lucas euangelista apud Antiochenam ecclesiam inueniens condemnauit, docens angelum dixisse ad Mariam: *spiritus sanctus superueniet in te et uirtus altissimi obumbrabit te. Ideoque id, quod nascetur, sanctum uocabitur filius dei.*

XI. Vndecima haeresis Valentinianorum a Valentino. Hi per orientem dispersi grauiter dei ecclesiam uulnerarunt dicentes profundum et altum secum commixta, ex quibus duobus, uelut ex coniugio, mundum processisse, altum dicentes patrem, profundum filium, eumque nihil assumpsisse de Maria uirgine, sed illum, tamquam aquam per riuum aut fistulam, sine ulla carnis assumptione transisse, carnis autem resurrectionem omnimodis denegantes. Hos anathematizauit beatus Zacchaeus Caesariensis episcopus, docens dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, deum uerum uerumque hominem, per uirinea secreta transisse, ex semine Dauid secundum carnem, sed hominem uere natum, uere passum, uere mortuum, uere resurrexisse a mortuis, et uere ascensisse in caelis.

XII. Duodecima haeresis Euandrianorum. Hoc solum a Valentinianis distant, quia addunt huic sectae etiam turpitudinem corporis, quam quasi illi pseudocasti declinare se simulant. Hos damnauit Diodorus episcopus Cretensis.

XIII. Tertia decima haeresis Ptolemaeitae a Ptolemaeo Valentini discipulo, qui hanc eandem haeresim acrius disputando dispersit, qui eodem tempore a sancto Zacchaeo supra memorato episcopo Caesariensi damnatus est. Haeresim tamen pessimam per multa spatia orientis dispersit.

XIV. Quarta decima haeresis a Marco quodam est adinuenta, qui negans resurrectionem carnis, Christum non uere passum, sed putatue conabatur astruere. Hunc sanctus Clemens romanus episcopus et Christi dignissimus martyr fixis et integris assertionibus confutans, et coram omni plebe in ecclesia detegens, aeterna damnatione puniuit, docens uere natum et passum dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, nihilque ab eo in phantasia factum commemorans et euidenter ostendens quod ueritas inimica falsitatis falsum in se nihil penitus habere potuerit, sicut nec lux in se tenebras habere potest, nec benedictio maledictionem, nec dulcedo amaritudinem, et si ista commisci possent, deum tamen docuit mendacio impossibile esse misceri.

The blessed apostle Paul taught them that they must turn to the spiritual sense of scriptures, and eventually reproached them as they were found in the various churches of Galatia; since they did not agree with his teachings he eventually anathematized them.

10. The tenth heresy is that of the Ebionites. They claim that the Lord Jesus Christ had merely been a man and decided that the mandates of the Law had to be kept according to Jewish practice. The evangelist Luke finding them in the church of Antioch condemned them, since the angel said to Mary: *The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. Therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God.*<sup>4</sup>

11. The eleventh heresy of the Valentinians was founded by Valentinus. These people, scattered throughout the East, deeply wounded the church, claiming that the Deep and the High were inter-mingled and that the world had arisen from their union, as if they were spouses, as they claimed that the High was the Father, and the Deep was the Son. Nothing was ever assumed by the Son from the virgin Mary, just like water runs through a canal or a water pipe: accordingly, the Son came out of the virgin Mary without ever assuming human flesh. They taught this, as they vehemently denied any kind of resurrection of the body. Blessed Zaccheus, bishop of Caesarea, anathematized them, as he taught that our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, came out of the virgin's birth canal; being of the seed of David according to the flesh, he was born as a real man; he really died; he really rose from the dead; and he really ascended into heaven.

12. The twelfth heresy is that of the Evandrians. They differ from the Valentinians merely on this account, namely that they added to the latter sect licentiousness of the body as well, refusing to simulate purity the way the Valentinians did. Diodorus, bishop of Crete condemned them.

13. The thirteenth heresy of the Ptolemaites was founded by Ptolemy, a disciple of Valentinus', who spread this heresy by means of even sharper polemics. He was eventually condemned by the previously mentioned holy bishop of Caesarea, Zaccheus. Nonetheless, this most wicked heresy spread through many eastern countries.

14. The fourteenth heresy was devised by a certain Marcus, who denied the resurrection of the body, and attempted to argue that Christ suffered only in an apparent but not real way. The holy Roman bishop and martyr of Christ Clement refuted this heresy with unshakable and well-thought-out arguments. He exposed it before the entire church congregation, punishing it with eternal damnation. Clement also taught that our Lord Jesus Christ was really born in the flesh and suffered, reminding his people that Christ did not do anything imaginary, and clearly showing that since truth is inimical to falsehood, there could not have been anything false in Christ, just like light cannot possibly contain darkness within itself, nor bitterness be found in sweetness, nor can a blessing contain a curse. Even in the event that these things for some reason were able to mix together, he taught that it is still impossible for God to have anything to do with lies.

---

<sup>4</sup> Lk 1:35.

XV. Quinta decima haeresis Colobrasiana a Colobrasio adinuenta. Vitam omnem hominum in septem stellis esse positam affirmabant, et has esse septem ecclesias et septem candelabra aurea conabatur astruere. Hunc sanctus Theodotus de Pergamo episcopus, habita synodo septem episcoporum, anathematizauit, docens septem ecclesias in septiformi spiritu consecratas. Vna forma est, inquit, cum in forma quam primus homo amiserat, reuocatur. Secunda, cum immaculatus, qui erat peccator, efficitur. Tertia, cum ex terra corpus mortuum suscitabitur. Quarta, cum anima de inferni claustris eruitur. Quinta, quod anima paradisi habitatione laetatur, quousque corpus suum incorruptibile recipiat. Sexta, quod filios deo facit qui erant filii Adae. Septima, quod facit hominem regni caelorum esse participem. Has esse sancti spiritus formas in septem ecclesiis, in septem oculis et in septem candelabris aureis collocatas.

XVI. Sexta decima haeresis Heracleonitarum ab Heracleone adinuenta est, qua baptizatum hominem siue iustum siue peccatorem loco sancti computari docebat, nihilque obesse baptizatis peccata memorabat, dicens, sicut non in se recipit natura ignis gelu, ita baptizatus non in se recipit peccatum. Sicut enim ignis resoluit aspectu suo niues, quantaecumque iuxta sint, sic semel baptizatus non recipit peccatorum reatum, etiam quantauis fuerint operibus eius peccata permixta. Hic in partibus Siciliae inchoauit docere. Contra hunc suscepérunt episcopi Siculorum, Eustachius Lilybaeorum et Panormeorum Theodorus. Quique omnium qui per Siciliam erant episcoporum synodus exorantes, gestis eum audire decreuerunt, et uniuersas assertiones eius dirigentes ad sanctum Alexandrum urbis episcopum rogauerunt ut ad eum confutandum aliquid ordinaret. Tunc sanctus Alexander, ad singula quaeque capita hydri singulos gladios dei uerbi de uagina diuinæ legis eiciens, librum contra Heracleonem ordinans, feruentissimum in ingenio Sabinianum presbyterum destinauit, qui et scriptis episcopi et assertione sua ita eum confutaret ut noctu media nauis praesidio fugeret et ultra ubinam deuenisset penitus nullus sciret.

XVII. Septima decima haeresis Ophitarum. Hi a colubro nominati sunt. Coluber enim, graece ὄφις dicitur. Habent ergo colubrum assuetum eorum panes lingua lambere, atque ita esse uelut eucharistiam sanctificare. Quem colubrum suum Christum appellant. Contra hos suscepérunt Bithyniae prouinciae sacerdotes, id est ciuitatis Chalcedoniae et Nicomediae episcopi Theocritus et Euander, et confutantes eos publice superarunt, atque superuentum facientes eis per collegia eorum in Bithyniae, ut dixi, partibus per possessiones clanculo ubi haec ipsa perpetrabant, et sacerdotes eorum eliminarunt, et serpentes eorum occiderunt, ac rationem reddentes omni populo maximam partem plebis ab hoc periculo liberarunt.

15. The fifteenth Colorbasian heresy was invented by Colorbasius. These people claimed that every human life depends on seven stars, and he himself tried to argue that these are the seven churches and the seven golden lamp stands [mentioned in the book of Revelation].<sup>5</sup> The holy bishop Theodotus of Pergamum, having gathered a council of seven bishops anathematized this view, teaching that the seven churches had been consecrated in a sevenfold spirit. Theodotus said that the first form was that in which the first man was created; the second, when a person who was a sinner is made sinless; the third, when the dead body is resurrected from the earth; the fourth, when the soul is plucked out of the gates of the underground; the fifth, so that the soul may rejoice in the dwelling of heaven until it receives its incorruptible body; the sixth, so that it may turn into children of God those who were children of Adam; the seventh, so that it may enable a person to partake of the kingdom of heaven. These are the seven forms of the Holy Spirit in the seven churches, placed in the seven eyes and in the seven lamp holders.

16. The sixteenth heresy of the Heracleonites was devised by Heracleon. This man taught that a baptized person, whether righteous or sinner, must be reckoned to dwell in a holy state. He also claimed that sins do not hurt at all those who have been baptized, saying that just as the nature of fire does not accommodate frost in itself, likewise baptized persons do not receive sin in themselves. In fact, just as fire due to its own nature melts the snow, no matter in what proportion the two elements are mixed together, likewise, baptized persons do not take in themselves the guilt that accompanies sins, no matter how many sins have been mixed together with their good works. Heracleon began to teach his views in some parts of Sicily. The bishops of Sicily rose up against him, such as Eustachius of Lilybaeum and Theodorus of Panormus. All those who invoked a synod of all Sicilian bishops resolved to listen to what Heracleon had done and notified the holy Alexander, bishop of that city, imploring him to issue some statement to refute him. At that point, the holy Alexander, drawing out of the scabbard of the divine law various swords of God's word against the numerous heads of this hydra, and ordering a book to be written against Heracleon, instructed the presbyter Sabinianus, a man of a most fervent mind, to refute him by employing the bishop's writings and his own statements. Heracleon eventually escaped from the city's garrison at night by means of a boat and nobody knows what ever happened to him after that.

17. The seventeenth heresy is that of the Ophites. They got this name from the Greek word ὄφις, meaning “serpent.” In fact, they have a snake which is accustomed to touch their loaves of bread with its tongue, and this is how they used to sanctify their eucharist: they call their serpent “Christ.” The priests from the province of Bithynia, namely the bishop Theocritus, from the city of Chalcedon, and Evander, from the city of Nicomedia rose up against them and eventually defeated them by refuting them in public. Launching an attack against their brotherhoods in Bithynia, in the properties where they conducted their rituals in secret, they killed their clergy and slaughtered their serpents; as they explained the reason for this to the whole people, they freed the greatest part of the population from this danger.

---

<sup>5</sup> Rev 1:20.

XVIII. Octaua decima haeresis, Caiani. Propterea sic appellati sunt, quoniam Cain honorant, dicentes eum fortissimae esse uirtutis. Simul et Iudam traditorem diuinum aliquid putant, asserentes eum praescisse quantum esset generi humano Christi passio profutura, et occidendum Iudeis propterea tradidisse. Hos ortos esse Mesopotamiani ecclesiarum Syiae sacerdotes ad ceteros suos coepiscopos conscripserunt. Quos triginta et duo episcopi apud Antiochiam residentes, cum eiusdem urbis episcopo Theodoro, in praesenti confutatos damnarunt, dicentes eis illud quod sanctus spiritus locutus est per prophetam: *“uae his qui dicunt de bono malum, et de malo bonum, qui ponunt tenebras lucem, et pro luce tenebras.* Constat ergo uos a uobis ipsis esse damnatos, qui eos uultis magnos et iustos ascribi, quos facti sui qualitate deus perpetuo gehennae incendio destinauit.”

XIX. Nona decima haeresis Sethianorum. Hi nomen acceperunt a filio Adae qui uocatus est Seth, de superna matre eum natum esse iactantes, quam conuenisse dicunt cum superno patre, unde diuinum semen aliud nasceretur, ex quo semine sibi deus iustos eligeret, et suos filios appellaret. Hi orti sunt in partibus Achaiae, contra quos suscepit sanctus Perigenes Argus ciuitatis antistes. Et ostendens eis de uno sancto uiro et iusto Isaac duos natos geminos, uno pariter utero editos, unum ad superiora diuinae gratiae penetrasse, alium ad inferiora inferi deuenisse, “unum itaque e duobus, inquit: aut naturae malae sunt filii, et ambo pro id quod sunt nati damnandi sunt, aut naturae bona sunt, et pro facti sui qualitate iuste alium benedictio coronauit, alium maledictio condemnauit.” Haec et his similia asserente sancto Perigene, aliquanti credentes conuersi sunt ab errore hoc pessimo, non credentes autem nec conuertentes gladio sunt anathematis amputati.

XX. Haeresis uicesima apud Cretam Archonticorum a principibus nomen accepit. Principes enim se colere iactant, quos dicunt condidisse hunc mundum. Hos sanctus Dioscorus Cretensis episcopus condemnauit, docens unum et uerum deum in partes substanciales penitus diuidi omnino non posse, hunc esse deum, qui se et prophetis ostendit, et in se credentes ab omnibus periculis liberauit, sicut Noe, sicut Abraham, Isaac, Iacob, Ioseph filiosque Israel, Ionam, Susanam, tres pueros, et innumerabilia erga credentes in se quae ostendit deus signa uirtutum, quibus se solum deum ostenderet. Acquiescentes ueritati recepit, dissentientes uero aeterna abominatione puniuit.

XXI. Prima et uicesima haeresis a Marcione orta est. Duo principia fuisse confirmat, boni et mali, quem Epiphanius tria dicebat principia docuisse, boni, iusti et praui, sed Eusebius Syrinum quendam, non Marcionem, trium principiorum atque naturarum scribit auctorem. Marcionitae, cum uniuersalem

18. The eighteenth heresy is that of the Cainites. They are called this way because they honor Cain, claiming that he was a man of the greatest virtue. Likewise, they regard the traitor Judas as something divine, claiming that he foreknew how greatly Christ's passion would have benefited humankind and that accordingly he betrayed him to the Jewish authorities. This sect arose in Mesopotamia, and the priests of the churches of Syria recruited their other fellow bishops. Thirty-two bishops residing near Antioch, together with Theodorus, bishop of that city, condemned them, having refuted them in person, saying to them what the Holy Spirit spoke through the prophet: *"Ah! Those who call evil good, and good evil, who change darkness to light, and light into darkness.*<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, it looks like you have just condemned yourselves by considering those whom God destined to the perpetual fire of Gehenna to be great and just people."

19. The nineteenth heresy is that of the Sethians. They got their name from Adam's son, named Seth. Its followers claim that he was born of a heavenly woman who had intercourse with a heavenly father, so that out of their union another heavenly offspring was born, out of which God chose for himself righteous people, and called them his children. These people were found in parts of Greece; the holy Perigenes, a priest from the city of Argon, rose up against them. And when he showed them with the example of the twins born of Isaac, both of them stemming from the same uterus, he pointed out that one entered the higher realms of divine grace, while the other landed in the lower regions of hell. Perigenes said: "Either one of these two things is true: 1) both twins are born of an evil nature, and because of that they were born to be condemned; or 2) they were born of a good nature, and thus owing to their qualities, one received a blessing and the other was condemned with a curse." As the holy Perigenes said these and other similar things, many followers repented of this worst error, but those who did not believe and recanted were cut down by the sword of a formal anathema.

20. The twentieth heresy of the Archontes, which arose near Crete, took its name from the Greek word for "rulers." They boast to worship these rulers, whom they credit with the creation of this world. The holy bishop of Crete, Dioscurus, condemned them, saying that the one true God cannot possibly be divided into substantial parts. He also said that this is the God who revealed himself to the prophets; freed those who believe in him from all dangers, such as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and his children, Israel, Jonah, Susannah, and the three children [in the furnace]; and who showed countless signs to those who believe in him, by which he revealed himself to be the only God. Dioscurus restored to fellowship those who submitted to the truth and sentenced those who disagreed with it to everlasting contempt.

21. The twenty-first heresy arose from Marcion. He asserted the existence of two principles, good and evil, though Epiphanius said he believed in three principles, namely the Good, the Just, and Evil; however, according to Eusebius, it was a certain Syrinus,

---

<sup>6</sup> Is 5:20.

orientis ecclesiam macularent, ab Origene superati, confutati, et per singulas sunt ciuitates damnati. Item post aliquantos annos, iam deuicti atque detecti, in Africanis partibus pullulabant, quos Tertullianus modis omnibus ita obtinuit ut ipsos ficeret contra sectam suam publice praedicare.

XXII. Vicesima secunda haeresis Apellitarum est, quorum est princeps Apelles, qui duos quidem introducit deos, sed unum fatetur principium, hoc est bonum, et ab ipso factum alterum, id est ab ipso uno principio ab ipso alterum factum est, quod, cum malignum esset inuentum, a bono abiectum est. Abiectum uero a bono principio hoc principium, quod malignabatur contra boni principii voluntatem, in sua malignitate mundum fecit. Inde est quod ad malum nos promptiores quam ad bonum natura consequitur, et plus in uitiis, inquit, quam in uirtutibus delectatur. Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum asserunt carnem ex elementis suscepisse, quam aeri reddidit dum ascenderet, et sine ea intravit in caelum. Hos Origenes ita perfecte superauit ut eorum causa περιοδευτής fieret, et per singulas quasque urbes per orientem eundo praedicaret. Et quia innumerabilia sunt tractatorum eius uolumina, haeretici superati libros eius ad suos libitus callidissima argumentatione mutarunt, ut quos uellent decipere, dicerent ita Origenem suis expositionibus definisse. Vnde quicumque usque hodie Origenem legit, si prudenti eum nouit recitatione distinguere, deprehendit loca ab haereticis maculata. Quod ita esse sanctus Pamphilus martyr in suo *Apologetico* declarauit.

XXIII. Vicesima et tertia haeresis Cerdonianorum a Cerdone cepit exordium, qui duo principia sibi aduersantia dogmatizauit, deumque legis ac prophetarum non esse patrem Christi, nec bonum esse deum, sed iustum, patrem uero Christi bonum, Christumque ipsum nec natum ex femina neque habuisse carnem nec uere mortuum uel quidquam passum, sed simulasse passionem. Contra hunc suscepit sanctus Apollonius episcopus Corinthiorum, eumque omni cum synodo orientali damnauit, reddens rationem hunc esse deum patrem domini nostri Iesu Christi de quo Moyses in capite libri sui dicit: *in principio fecit deus caelum ac terram*. Omnes ueteris testamenti irreprehensibiles secundum apostolum approbauit dicens: *quis accusabit aduersus electos dei? Deus qui iustificat? Quis est qui condemnat?* Haec autem et his similia. Hac de causa condemnatis haereticis rationabili sermone, uidebantur satis facere sacerdotes siue ut a praecipitio reuocarent, siue ut se ostenderent sectas damnare, non homines. Homines autem seipso damnare, qui damnatas sectas amplectentes a ueritate discedunt.

and not Marcion who came up with three principles or natures. (d) The Marcionites, after they polluted the entire Eastern Church, were eventually overcome by Origen, and condemned by each and every city. Also, after several years, having already been exposed and utterly defeated, they began to sprout in some parts of Africa. Tertullian prevailed over them in so many ways that they began to preach in public against his own sect.

22. The twenty-second heresy is that of the Apellites, whose leader was Apelles. This man introduced two gods. He claimed that originally there was only the main one, namely the good god, since the other was made by him: in other words, this second god originated from the first principle, and because he became evil, he was rejected by the first god. This god, having been rejected by the good god because he acted against his will, created the world out of spite. It follows that human beings are naturally more inclined toward evil than goodness, and enjoy vices more than they do virtues. These people claim that our Lord Jesus Christ derived his human flesh from nature's elements, which he eventually shed as he ascended into heaven, thus entering heaven without it. Origen crushed them so thoroughly that their cause ended up being preached [only] in isolated towns in the East. Considering that the works of Origen's literary production are so numerous, the vanquished heretics employed crafty arguments as they altered [some of] his books to fit their views so that, as they attempted to deceive people, they claimed that Origen upheld such views in his works. Consequently, anyone who reads Origen's works today, unless they are able to read them carefully and prudently, will end up disapproving of those passages that were altered by these heretics. This is what the holy martyr Pamphilus stated in his *Apology for Origen*.

23. The twenty-third heresy is that of the Cerdonians, which was founded by Cerdon. This man propounded as dogma that there are two principles opposed to each other, and that the god of the Law and of the prophets is neither the Father of Christ, nor a good god; rather, it is the good god who is the just god and the good Father of Christ. Christ himself was neither born from a woman, nor had real flesh; he did not really die or suffer, but only pretended to suffer. The holy bishop of Corinth, Apollonius, took Cerdon to task and condemned him in a synod of eastern bishops, showing the reason why the God of whom Moses said at the beginning of Genesis: "He created heaven and earth" must indeed be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Apollonius approved of all the blameless saints of the Old Testament, about whom Paul said: *Who will bring a charge against God's chosen ones? It is God who acquits us. Who will condemn?*<sup>7</sup> and similar things. Once the heretics' cause had been condemned with rational arguments, the clergy appeared to go out of their way to both recall them from the brink of the precipice and to show that they condemned the sects and not individual people. Nonetheless, some people ended up condemning themselves and, by embracing condemned sects, departed from the truth.

---

<sup>7</sup> Rom 8:33,34.

XXIV. Vicesima et quarta est haeresis Seuerianorum, qui sunt a Seueriano exorti. Vinum non bibunt, eo quod fabulosa uanitate de semine Satanae terram germinasse asserunt uitem. Carnis quoque resurrectionem cum ueteri respuunt testamento. Hos damnauit sanctus Euphranon episcopus Rhodius – apud Rhodum enim horum supersticio orta est –, quos conuicit scripturarum ratione sanctorum, in quibus legitur deus educere de terra panem ad confirmandum cor hominis, et uinum ad laetificandum. Vini autem non usus necessarius, sed nimetas inimica saluti culpanda est. Carnis uero resurrectionem ab illo promissam esse qui in praesenti mortuos suscitabat, qui, si mentitus fuisse, mortuos utique suscitare non potuisset. Sanctos esse apices testamenti ueteris, sicut fundamenta domus praeclare edocuit dicens: “fundamenta domus circa squalida loca sunt posita, ut ea quae sunt superius nullam contumeliam stercorum patientur. Superiora ergo domus laquearibus auratis, parietibus pictis et uario marmororum metallo sunt edita. Inferiora uero, humori terreno uicina, digesta etiam superiorum uniuersa suscipiunt. Quid ergo nunc faciemus? Si auferimus inferiora, superiora corruunt. Tamen si destruenda erant inferiora, non hoc alius poterat nisi dei filius facere. Videamus ergo utrumnam ipse destruxerit hoc quod nos dicimus permanere: ‘*putatis, inquit, quia ueni legem destruere aut prophetas? Non ueni legem soluere, sed adimplere.*’” Haec et his similia dicens sanctus Euphranon episcopus multos conuertit. In errore uero perseverantes perpetua sanctione a communione priuauit.

XXV. Vicesima quinta haeresis est Tatianorum a Tatiano quodam instituta, qui et encratitiae appellati sunt. Hi nuptias damnant, atque omnino pares eas fornicationibus aliisque corruptionibus faciunt, nec recipiunt in suo numero coniugio utentem, marem uel feminam. Non uescuntur carnis, easque omnino abominantur. Contra hos suscepit sanctus Epiphanius Ancyrae Galatiae episcopus, obiciens eis Pauli apostoli epistolam ad Timotheum primam, eo quod habeant *cauteriatam conscientiam*, prohibentes *nubere*, et *abstinere* docentes *a cibis quos deus creauit ad percipiendum cum gratiarum actione fidelibus et his qui cognouerunt ueritatem, quia omnis creatura dei bona est, et nihil abiciendum quod cum gratiarum actione percipitur*. *Sanctificatur enim per uerbum dei et orationem.* Abstinentes autem nostros catholicos idcirco laudamus quia, quando non accipiunt, non propterea non accipiunt, quasi qui dicant malum esse accipere, sed bonum dicunt et optimum, quod se asserunt esse ad percipiendum indignos. Sic fit ut et illud statutum apostoli conseruetur quod ait: *non manducans*

24. The twenty-fourth heresy of the Severians was founded by Severus. They do not drink wine because according to their deluded imagination the earth produced grapes out of Satan's seed. They also reject the resurrection of the body together with the Old Testament. The holy bishop of Rhodes, Euphranus (since this superstitious sect arose in that town), refuted them by appealing to the holy scriptures, in which one reads that God drew bread from the earth to strengthen people's hearts and wine to cheer them up.<sup>8</sup> Though using wine is not necessary, excess of it is to be blamed as harmful to people's health. The resurrection of the body has been promised by the one who rose people from the dead in his own day and age; had he lied about it, he would not have been able to raise them. Bishop Euphranus taught that the points made in the Old Testament are holy, acting as the foundations of a beautiful home. He said: "The foundations of a house are placed on filthy ground, so that what goes on top of them may not be remotely affected by the mud and dirt. Thus, the upper floors of the house are adorned with golden panels, painted walls, and various types of marble. However, the lower floors which are closer to the moisture of the ground also receive all the things that are found on the upper floors. So, what are we going to do? If we remove the lower floors, the upper floors will collapse. Yet, if the lower floors were to be destroyed, no one could do this except the Son of God. However, let's see whether he himself destroyed what we say must be retained: *Do not think that I have come to abolish the law or the prophets. I have come not to abolish but to fulfill.*"<sup>9</sup> By saying this and similar things holy Euphranus induced many bishops [to come back to the fold]. However, he also perpetually excommunicated those who persevered in this error.

25. The twenty-fifth heresy of the Tatians was founded by a certain Tatian; they were also called Encratites. These people condemn marriage and regard it as entirely equal to all other types of fornications and corruptions, nor do they accept in their rank those who have sexual relations with their spouses, whether men or women. They do not eat meat and even abhor it altogether. Holy Epiphanius, bishop of Ancyra, in Galatia, objected to them what Paul said in his first letter to Timothy: *They forbid marriage and require abstinence from foods that God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth. For everything created by God is good, and nothing is to be rejected when received with thanksgiving, for it is made holy by the invocation of God in prayer.*<sup>10</sup> Nonetheless we do praise our fellow Catholics because, when they do not eat meat they say that they are not worthy to partake of it, and not as if it was wrong to eat it (they do say indeed that it is good and even excellent). This is indeed the case, and therefore let us retain the apostle Paul's decision when he said: *The one who eats must not despise the one who abstains, and the one who abstains must*

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Ps 103 (104): 14–15.

<sup>9</sup> Mt 5:17.

<sup>10</sup> 1 Tim 4:3–5.

*manducantem non iudicet, et manducans non manducantem non spernat.* Non enim creaturam accusat, sed se esse talem pronuntiat quo se dicat huius epulis refici non mereri.

XXVI. Vicesima et sexta haeresis Cataphryges orti sunt, qui hoc nomen a prouincia, non a dogmate assumpserunt, quorum auctores fuerunt Montanus, Prisca et Maximilla. Hi itaque aduentum spiritus sancti a domino promissum in se potius quam in apostolis fuisse asserunt redditum. Secundas nuptias pro fornicationibus habent, et ideo dicunt eas permisisse apostolum Paulum quia ex parte sciebat, et ex parte prophetabat. Nondum enim uenerat quod perfectum est. Hoc autem perfectum in Montanum et in eius prophetissas, quas supra diximus, uenisse delirant. Hactenus dixerim de Cataphrygis. Cetera quae dicuntur quasi incerta praetereo. De infantis sanguine eos accipere, quod ideo dicimus ne uideamur ignorare omnia quae de eis dicuntur. Hi enim qui contra eos scripserunt nihil hinc penitus memorarunt. Scripsit contra eos librum sanctus Soter papa urbis et Apollonius Ephesiorum antistes, contra quos scripsit Tertullianus presbyter Carthaginiensis, qui cum omnia bene et prime et incomparabiliter scripserit, in hoc solum se reprehensibilem fecit, quod Montanum defendit agens contra Soterem supradictum urbis papam, asserens falsa esse de sanguine infantis, trinitatem in unitate deitatis, paenitentiam lapsis, mysteriis eisdem unum Pascha nobis cum. “Hoc solum discrepamus, inquit, quod secundas nuptias non recipimus, et prophetiam Montani de futuro iudicio non recusamus.” Obiciunt quidam Tertulliano, quod animam ex traduce, id est animam dixerit ita gigni ex anima, sicut ex corporibus corpus, quod catholica fides uehementer execratur.

XXVII. Vicesima septima haeresis Pepitianorum, qui a loco quodam nominati sunt, quam desertam ciuitatem dicit Epiphanius. Hanc autem isti diuinum aliquid esse arbitrantes, Hierusalem uocant, tantum dantes mulieribus principatum ut sacerdotio quoque apud eos honorentur. Dicunt enim duas ecclesias Quintillae et Priscillae in eadem ciuitate Pepuza. Vnum sunt cum Cataphrygis. Contemptui autem eos habent, quod se isti Pepuziani ceteris aestiment meliores. Dicunt enim hanc Pepuzam uillam fuisse Montani, Priscae et Maximillae, et quia ibi cooperunt praedicare et ibi uixerunt, ideo locum appellari Hierusalem. Et quia habitatores loci sunt, ideo ceteris se esse meliores ascribunt. Hos Apollonius superauit Ephesiorum episcopus.

XXVIII. Vicesima octaua haeresis Artotyritas suos uocat quibus hoc nomen oblatio dedit. Offerunt enim panem et caseum, dicentes a primis hominibus oblationes deo de fructibus terrae

*not pass judgment on the one who eats.*<sup>11</sup> As it turns out, when people say they do not have the right to eat this food, they do not really condemn those who do, but rather themselves.

26. The twenty-sixth heresy of the Cataphrygians took its name from the province they came from, and not from the beliefs that were propounded by Montanus, Prisca and Maximilla. These people claimed that the coming of the Holy Spirit, promised by the Lord, had occurred in them rather than in the apostles. They regard second marriage as fornication and claim that the apostle Paul allowed it because at times he spoke and prophesized on his own account. They were deluded in their claim that the Holy Spirit had come in a perfect manner in Montanus and in his two prophetesses previously mentioned. I will now say a few more things about this sect, but omit those others that are uncertain, such as their partaking of the blood of infants, which I mention so as not to appear to ignore all the things that are being said about them. In fact, those who wrote against them did not mention any of these things. The holy Pope Soter and Apollonius, bishop of Ephesus, wrote a book against them, but were criticized in writing by Tertullian, a priest of Carthago. Tertullian, who had previously written mostly well and in an un-surpassing way, is to be blamed only for this, namely that he defended Montanus in his response to Pope Soter, claiming that the rumors about the blood of infants were false, though he was one with us when it came to argue about the Trinity in the unity of the deity, the penance of lapsed Christians, and the Paschal mysteries. Tertullian went on to say: “We disagree [with the Church] only on these matters, namely that we reject [the possibility of] second marriage and that we do not reject Montanus’ prophecy about future judgement.” Some people object to Tertullian the idea that the soul is transmitted from the parents, namely that the soul gives birth to another soul just like a body comes from another body, which is something the Catholic faith wholeheartedly detests.

27. The twenty-seventh heresy is that of the Peputians, who take their name from a certain location, which Epiphanius said was an abandoned town. These people call it “Jerusalem” because according to them it was something divine. They attribute to women such power that they are honored among them with the priesthood as well. They named two churches in the town of Pepuza after Quintilla and Priscilla. They are one and the same with the Cataphrygians, though they hold the latter in contempt because these Peputians consider themselves better than the others. They claim that this Pepuza had been the country home of Montanus, Prisca and Maximilla, and in lieu of the fact that these three began their preaching ministry and also lived there, they call it “Jerusalem.” Again, since they inhabit the place, they consequently think themselves to be better than others. The bishop of Ephesus, Apollonius, vanquished them.

28. The twenty-eight heresy of the Artotyrites derives its name from the things that its followers offered as oblations. They offer bread and cheese, claiming that oblations were offered to God by the first human beings from the fruit of the earth

---

<sup>11</sup> Rom 14:3.

et ouium fuisse celebratas. Hos Pepuzianis iungit Epiphanius, contra quos nullus dignatus est nec loqui.

XXIX. Vicesima nona haeresis Tessarescaedecatiae dicuntur, eo quod quarta decima luna Pascha celebrant, quilibet septimanae occurrerit dies, et si dies dominicus incurrit, ipso die ieunant et uigilant. Hoc tantum a nobis discrepant, nihil aliud. Hos sanctus Iohannes Constantinopolites episcopus tali ratione in multis ciuitatibus obtinuit. Abiit cum clero suo, et cum eis Pascha celebrauit dicens: “sicut nos uobis cum celebrauimus Pascha, uenite et uos nobis cum suspicite.” A quibus cum hoc impetravit, cooperunt unum sapere et nobis cum celebrare diem. Probauerunt enim totam fidei regulam sic nos sicut se tenere, sic illos sicut nos credere.

XXX. Tricesima haeresis Alogiorum. Propterea sic uocantur quia uerbum dei esse filium accipere nolunt, in tantum ut euangelium sancti Iohannis dicant ipsius non esse. Nec Apocalypsim accipiunt eiusdem Iohannis. Quid multa? Omnia nobis cum sapiunt; uerbum dei filium dei penitus quasi blasphemiam exsecrantur. Hos Philo episcopus saepe superauit.

XXXI. Tricesima prima haeresis Adamianorum, qui ex Adam nomen acceperunt, cuius imitantur in paradiſo nuditatem, qualis fuit ante peccatum. Vnde et nuptias auersantur, quia nec prius quam dimissus esset de paradiſo cognouit uxorem. Credunt ergo quod nuptiae futurae non fuissent, si nemo peccasset. Nudi itaque mares feminaeque conueniunt, nudi lectiones audiunt, nudi orant, nudi celebrant sacramenta. Et ex hoc paradiſum suam arbitrantur ecclesiam. Hos sanctus presbyter Polycarpus detexit, obtinuit, eliminauit.

XXXII. Tricesima et secunda haeresis Helcesaeorum. Hos quidam Helchi nomine pseudopropheta decepit, ex cuius genere duas mulieres tamquam deas ab eis perhibetur adoratas. Cetera Hebionaeis similia tenere ab Epiphanio asseruntur. Hos Papias presbyter Achaiae obtinuit.

XXXIII. Tricesimum et tertium locum haeresis tenent Theodotiani, a quodam Theodotione instituti, hominem tantummodo Christum dei filium asserentes, quod dicitur idem Theodotio propterea docuisse, quia in persecutione lapsus isto modo se casus sui deuitare putabat opprobrium, si non deum negasse, sed hominem uideretur. Hos obtinuit Craton episcopus Syrorum.

XXXIV. Tricesimam quartam haeresim Melchisedechiani inuenerunt. Melchisedech sacerdotem dei excelsi, non hominem fuisse, sed uirtutem dei esse arbitrantur, illum locum sequentes

and from flocks. Epiphanius associated them with the Peputians, whom he did not find worthy to criticize.

29. The twenty-ninth heresy of the Tesseradecatites has gotten its name because its followers celebrate Easter on the fourteenth day of the lunar calendar, no matter what day of the week it happens to be, though if it happens on a Sunday they fast and remain awake during this day. They differ from us Catholics only on this account and nothing else. The holy bishop of Constantinople, John, prevailed over them on this issue in many cities. He left with his clergy and celebrated Easter with them, saying: “Just as we celebrated Easter with you, now come and celebrate it with us.” As he begged them to do this, they eventually came to acknowledge and celebrate our Easter. In fact, they accepted the entire rule of faith just like we do and believe as we believe.

30. The thirtieth heresy is of the Alogi: they have this name because they refuse to accept that the Word of God is God’s Son insofar as they claim that neither John’s Gospel nor the book of Revelation were authored by him. Need I say more? Though they agree with us on everything else, they abhor the idea that the Word of God is God’s Son almost as if it was a blasphemy. Bishop Philo often argued successfully with them.

31. Heresy number thirty-one is that of the Adamites, who took their name from Adam. They imitate his nudity in Paradise, as he walked about prior to the Fall. Consequently, they opposed marriage, because Adam did not have carnal relationship with his wife prior to being expelled from paradise. They also believe there would not have been marriages if no one had sinned. Therefore, they gather together, males and females, totally naked, and in that state they listen to the readings, pray and celebrate the sacraments. Because of this, they regard their church to be paradise. Holy presbyter [and bishop] Polycarp exposed them, prevailed over them and excommunicated them.

32. The thirty-second heresy is of the Elcesei. This sect originated from a pseudo-prophet by the name of Elcesa: this sect worshiped two women from his family as if they were goddesses. Epiphanius claimed that they shared all their other beliefs with the Ebionites. The presbyter Papias from Achaia dealt with them.

33. The Theodotians represent the thirty-third heresy. Founded by a certain Theodotian, they claim that Christ the Son of God was only a human being. Rumor has it that this is what Theodotian himself taught, since, having lapsed during a persecution, he thought he could avoid the shame of his downfall if he did not appear to have denied God, but only a human being. Crato, the Syrian bishop, overcame them.

34. The Melkisedekians invented the thirty-fourth heresy. According to them, Melkisedek, the priest of the Most High God<sup>12</sup> was not a mere mortal man, but a divine power, as they followed that passage in the *Letter to the Hebrews* in which it

---

<sup>12</sup> Gen 14:18–20.

apostoli ad Hebraeos quo ait: *sine patre, sine matre, sine genealogia*. His occurrit Dionysius Hierosolymorum episcopus, dicens hunc et patrem habuisse et matrem, et hoc ideo dixisse apostolum, quia et genealogia ipsius et materna paternaue prosapia non haberetur in eo ordine in quo lex Hebraeorum ascripta est, cum deo utique placuerit generatio Hebraeorum.

XXXV. Tricesima quinta haeresis sunt Bardesanitae, a quodam Bardesane peruersi. Qui Bardesan dicitur perfectus fuisse catholicus, sed postea in id per Valentini discipulum incurrisse ut malam diceret carnis humanae creaturam, animae bonam. Hunc in Cappadocia damnauit Theocritus episcopus, docens deum bonum utraque fecisse, utraque copulasse, et carnis humanae non naturam, sed praeuaricationem esse culpandam.

XXXVI. Haeresis tricesima et sexta Noetianorum est, qui dicunt eundem esse Christum et spiritum sanctum, non per substantiam, sicut nos, sed per personam, ut putative dicatur spiritus sanctus, non ueraciter. Hic damnatus est a Tranquillo episcopo Chalcedoniorum Syiae. Ostendit enim patrem uerum, *<filium uerum>*, spiritum sanctum uerum, unum quidem deum per unam substantiam, sed tres per distinctionem personas credi debere confirmans.

XXXVII. In tricesima et septima haeresi Valesii incurrerunt, qui infelices et seipso castrant et hospites suos. Hoc modo dicunt illud impleri: *qui se castrauerunt propter regnum caelorum*. Alia quoque haeretica docere dicuntur et turpia, sed quae illa sint nec ipse Epiphanius commemorat, nec uspiam potui reperire. Hi a synodo sunt damnati Achaiae.

XXXVIII. In tricesima octaua haeresi Catharoi, qui seipso isto nomine quasi propter munditiam superbissime appellarunt. Secundas nuptias non admittunt. Paenitentiam denegant, Nouatum sectantes haereticum: unde etiam Nouatiani appellantur. Contra hunc beatus Xystus martyr et episcopus, et uenerabilis Cyprianus martyr Christi, tunc Carthaginiensis pontifex, scripsit contra Nouatum librum *De lapsis*, quod possint per paenitentiam recuperare gratiam quam labendo perdiderant, quod Nouatus asserebat fieri omnino non posse.

XXXIX. Tricesima et nona haeresis Angelicorum est. Hi Angelicos se uocari uoluerunt. Dicunt enim angelos debere adorari et excoli animo, et ipsis preces effundi, ut ipsi quem sciunt posse plus a se, ipsi faciant uotis hominum et petitionibus subuenire. Hos Epiphanius iam omnino defecisse testatur uictos a Theophilo Apamaeo episcopo.

XL. Quadragesimo loco apparuerunt Apostolici, qui se hoc nomine arroganter appellari uoluerunt, eo quod in suam communionem non recipiunt utentes coniugibus et res proprias possidentes, quales habet catholica et monachos et clericos

is said [that he was]: *without father, mother, or ancestry*.<sup>13</sup> The bishop of Jerusalem, Dionysius, opposed them, saying that he indeed have a mother and a father. According to him, the author of Hebrews said the same thing, because his ancestry and paternal and maternal family was not kept in that same order in which the law of the Hebrews was written, when the listing of the generations of the Jewish people was found pleasing by God.

35. The thirty-fifth heresy is that of the Bardaisanites, led into error by a certain Bardaisan. This person was rumored to have been a Catholic in excellent standing; however, he was later led astray by a disciple of Valentinus as he claimed that the flesh and blood of creatures are evil, but that their souls are good. Bishop Theocritus condemned him in Cappadocia, as he taught that God made both body and soul good, joined them together, and that what is to be blamed is not the nature of human flesh, but its transgressions.

36. The thirty-sixth heresy is that of the Noetians, who say that Christ and the Holy Spirit are one and the same, not in their substance, like we believe, but in their person, so that the Holy Spirit is spoken of not as if he was a real person, but an alleged one. Tranquillus, Syrian bishop of Chalcedon condemned this view, as he confirmed that we must believe that the true Father, the true Son and the true Holy Spirit are one God in one substance, but three distinct persons.

37. The Valesii, who castrate themselves and their unfortunate guests, incurred the thirty-seventh heresy. They claim that by doing this they are fulfilling [the gospel passage where Jesus said]: *There are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of heaven's kingdom*.<sup>14</sup> (e) There are also other heretical teachings that they uphold, including shameful ones, though neither does Epiphanius mention them, nor was I able to discover them anywhere. This people were condemned by a synod in Achaia.

38. The thirty-eight heresy of the Cathars was given its name by its followers who very proudly claimed to be pure. They forbid second marriage, deny the value of penance, and follow the heretic Novatus, so that they are also called “Novatianists.” The blessed Pope and martyr Xystus and the venerable martyr of Christ Cyprian condemned them. Cyprian, at the time bishop of Carthage, wrote against Novatus the book *De lapsis* [On the Fallen], claiming that the fallen may find again the grace which they forfeited by backsliding after [a sincere] repentance, which is something that Novatus claimed to be absolutely impossible.

39. The thirty-ninth heresy is that of the Angelici. They chose this name for themselves. They claim that angels must be adored and spiritually honored. They used to offer prayers to them, so that angels may come to the aid of people's vows and petitions. Epiphanius established that they were utterly vanquished by bishop Theophilus Apameus.

40. In the fortieth instance we notice the Apostolici, who arrogantly wanted to be called by this name because they do not welcome in their group those who are married

---

<sup>13</sup> Heb 7:3.

<sup>14</sup> Mt 19:12.

plurimos. Ideo ergo isti haeretici sunt, quia se ab ecclesia separantes, nullam spem eos putant habere qui utuntur his rebus, quibus ipsi carent. His in eo testimonio occurrit ecclesia, in quo dicit apostolus: “etiamsi corpus meum non solum abstinentiis macerem, sed etiam tradam eum igni ut ardeat, *caritatem autem non habeam nihil mihi prodest.*”

XLI. In quadragesima et prima haeresi Sabelliani a Sabellio incurrerunt, ipsum sibi patrem, ipsum sibi filium, ipsum sibi sanctum spiritum confitentes. Hi sunt qui et Praxeani dicuntur, qui habuerunt inter initia Praxeam quendam doctorem. Dicuntur et Hermogeniani, quia Hermogenem habuerunt in Sabellii contubernio. His occurrit Dositheus episcopus Seleuciae, docens eum totam trinitatem negare, dum se aestimat unitatem defendere. Pater enim ingenitus, filius genitus, Spiritus sanctus procedens ex patre, coaequalis per omnia patri et filio. Deitas enim sic recipit unitatem substantiae, ut distinctionem personae non perdat.

XLII. Quadragesimam et secundam haeresim Origeniani inchoauerunt, a quodam Origene, non illo qui fere omnibus notus est, sed alio Syro quodam sceleratissimo, de quo dicit Epiphanius quod tam turpia docuerit ut nec debeant per scripturam ad nostros posteros destinari.

XLIII. Quadragesimam et tertiam haeresim alii Origeniani continuo subsecuti sunt, ut dicit Epiphanius, qui et mortuorum resurrectionem negant. Christi autem creaturam esse sanctum spiritum dicunt, paradisum autem et caelos allegorice dicta firmantes. Hi duo Origenes praua quaeque quae scripserunt haeretici et peruersi doctores nostro Origeni catholico tractatori miscuerunt ut adimpleretur quod dicitur a domino in Euangeliis: “*nonne bonum semen seminasti in agro tuo? Vnde ergo haec zizania? Qui respondens ait: ‘inimicus homo haec fecit.’*” Ideo enim Origenem legentes inuenimus catholicum, et contra haereses dimicantem et uincentem; identidem legentes Origenem inuenimus haereticum et aduersa fidei astuentem. Litterae uerba tradunt et sensus: si possent et facies loquentium demonstrare, errorem nullus poterat de persona doctoris incurrere. Nam et illud cauendum est quod Ampullianus quidam haeresiarches Bithynius, qui docebat post Origenem ecclesiam dei. Hic incurrerit talem haeresim ut diceret omnes criminosos cum diabolo et daemoniis eosque in gehenna decoqui usquequo puri redditii possint inde mundi et immaculati egredi, ad hoc quod antea fuerant alieni a culpa suo iterum creatori restitui. Hic dum argueretur ab uniuersali ecclesia, coepit proferre libros Origenis quos ipse uitiauerat, et dicere: “*ecce quia Origenes ita sensit, et praecipue in quatuor Περὶ ἀρχῶν libris.*” Sed qui sani sensus est, et habet mentis splendidos oculos, sic uidet

and own private property, the way the Catholic church does in the case of monastics and many clergymen. Therefore, these people are heretics because, as they separate from the Church, think that those who use these things, which they themselves lack, have no hope of salvation. The Church opposed them by quoting the witness of the scriptural passage: *Even if I wore down my body with various forms of penance, and also set it on fire so that it may burn, but do not have love, it does me no good.* (f)

41. The forty-first heresy is that of the Sabellians, founded by Sabellius. They confess that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are one and the same person. They are the same people who are called Praxeans, because among their founders they had a certain teacher named Praxeas. They are also called Hermogenians, because Hermogenes was an associate of Sabellius'. They were opposed by Dositheus, bishop of Seleucia, who taught that by thinking he was defending the unity [of the divine persons] Sabellius denied the whole Trinity. In fact, the Father is unbegotten, the Son is begotten, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and is coequal in all things with the Father and the Son. Thus, God enjoys such unity of substance without losing the distinction of persons.

42. The Origenians began the forty-second heresy, which owes its name to a certain Origen, who is not to be confused with the universally known figure but is rather another most wicked Syrian. Epiphanius said that this man taught such shameful things that they must not to be put in writing for posterity's sake.

43. Other Origenians, whom Epiphanius lists right after the previous ones, gave birth to the forty-third heresy. These people deny the resurrection of the dead; claim that the Holy Spirit is yet another creature of Christ; and say that heaven and the various spiritual abodes are to be interpreted in an allegorical fashion. These two heretical and perverse teachers also named Origen who wrote evil things were mixed up with our Catholic teacher Origen,(g) thus fulfilling what the Lord said in the Gospel: "Sir, did you not sow good seed in your field? How then does it have weeds? And he said to them, *An enemy has done this!*"<sup>15</sup> Thus, as we read Origen's works we find him to be a Catholic who fought against and vanquished heresies; but as we keep reading his works we [nonetheless] find him to be heretical and setting up beliefs that are contrary to our faith. Letters convey words and their meaning. If they were able to reveal the faces of those who utter them, no one would be liable to be mistaken about the person of a teacher. Now, this is what we should watch out for in the case of Ampullianus, the Bithynian heresiarch, who taught in the church of God after Origen's death. This man incurred such a great heresy that he claimed that all wicked sinners are cast into hell with the devil and his demons until they are allowed to leave at the moment when, having been made pure and spotless, they are finally restored by their creator to that state from which they had become alienated because of their own transgression. As this Ampullianus came to be criticized by the whole church, he started to quote from those books of Origen's which he himself had altered, saying: "Here is what Origen believed, as he claimed especially in four of his books of his *Peri archon*." But anyone

---

<sup>15</sup> Mt 13:27,28.

addita in Origenis opusculis mala ista atque cognoscit, sicut si in stragulo coccineo pannos albos aut cuiusque alterius coloris cernat assutos. Quod ita esse sanctus martyr Pamphilus docet, qui, antequam ad martyrii coronam attingeret, irreprehensibiliter cathedram episcopatus obtinuit, et sanam doctrinam dei populis ministrauit. Hic edidit *Apologeticum*, et omnia quae de Origene catholici ignorantes mentiuntur exclusit, ostendens ea quae reprehensibilia inueniuntur in eius opusculis Origenis non esse, sed eorum quos ipse superauerat, alia uero quae tota peruersa sunt, aliorum duorum haereticorum esse, qui Origenis nomen, non fidem nec conscientiam habuerunt.

XLIV. Quadragesima et quarta haeresis a Paulo Samosateo inuenta. Paulianum sibi populum fecit. Christum non semper fuisse, sed a Maria coepisse, nec amplius eum aliud quam hominem dicunt. Haec haeresis antea fuit Artemonis, quae cum defecisset, ab isto Paulo Samosateo restaurata est. Item contra hunc suscipiens ecclesia, licet post multos annos, dum defecisset cum assertoribus prava defensio, a Photino nostro episcopo renouata iterum, Photinianum populum pullulauit. Siue ergo Artemonianos audias siue Paulianos siue Photinianos, unum scias, sicut Donatistas et Monteses et Parmenianos uocamus, Donatistas a Donato, Monteses a montis latebra, Parmenianos a Parmeniano, qui per totam Africam libros contra nos conficiens, et nouos psalmos faciens circumibat, contra quem noster scripsit Optatus. Sed redeamus ad Paulianos. Omnibus notum est nos haereticos uenientes non rebaptizare, sed ad manum reconciliationis accedere, et ita diuino populo tradere sociandos. De Paulianis autem sancta synodus Nicaena hoc constituit ut prorsus baptizentur, et ita demum catholico populo socientur. Vnde ego credo regulam eos baptismatis integrum non tenere, et ideo hoc decretum a Christi pontificibus constitutum.

XLV. Quadragesima et quinta haeresis Photinianorum est a Photino, quem sic dixi nostrum episcopum fuisse, sicut fuit noster Iudas Scariotes apostolus. Hic suum populum fecit. Hominem quidem purum fuisse Christum docebat, et a Maria coepisse cum Paulo Samosateo sentiebat, sed spiritum sanctum semper fuisse memorabat. Hoc solum quadragesimae quartae haeresi dissimilis, quod populum a se peruersum suo nomine nuncupauit. Et hic a synodo Nicaena confutatus est.

XLVI. Quadragesima et sexta haeresis a Mani inchoata Manichaeorum contubernium fecit. Hic Mani, cum esset ciuis Persa, et in Persida docens se apostolum dei diceret, etiam ad Graeciam deuolutus est. Quem Graeci discipuli eius deuiantes nomen insaniae Mannichaeum uocari decreuerunt, id est quasi

of a sane mind, and whose eyes are wide open, would be able to tell and recognize that such pernicious views were added to Origen's writings, just as one would be able to see that white patches or patches of any other color were sewed onto a red blanket. This is what the holy martyr Pamphilus taught, who, prior to attaining the crown of martyrdom, inherited in an irreprehensible manner the episcopal dignity and shared orthodox doctrine with the people of God. Pamphilus wrote *Apology for Origen* and edited out all the false things that people who are ignorant of Origen attribute to him, pointing out that all the reprehensible teachings that are found in Origen's writings were not really authored by him, but rather by those whom he himself exposed. Also, he showed that all those wicked teachings were started by those two heretics who shared Origen's name but not his faith and good conscience.

44. The forty-fourth heresy was invented by Paul of Samosata, who gathered many followers around himself. They claimed that Christ did not always exist but began to exist after he was born from Mary and that he was nothing more than a man. Artemon taught this heresy before they did; after he died, it was revived by this Paul of Samosata. The Church reacted against him as well, although after many years, despite the fact that its evil apology was defeated together with its champions, it was once again revived by the [at the time] Catholic bishop Photinus, who gathered around himself a great number of followers. Whether you listen to the Artemonians, or the Paulinists, or the Photinians, just know that they are one and the same, just as we said about the Donatists, the Monteses, and the Parmenians (the Donatists owing their name to [bishop] Donatus; the Monteses to their hiding place in a mountain; and the Parmenians to [bishop and successor to Donatus] Parmenianus). The latter groups, which composed many books against us throughout Africa and even wrote new psalms, were refuted in writing by our bishop Optatus. But let us return to the Paulinists. As everybody knows, we do not re-baptize heretics who return to our fold but become reconciled with them through a shaking of hands, and thus include in the people of God those who are going to rejoin us. The holy synod of Nicaea decided instead that they were to be re-baptized and rejoin the Catholic flock in this fashion. Because I believe that these Paulinists do not preserve intact the rule of baptism, I conclude that it was for this reason that this decree was established by Christ's bishops [at Nicaea].

45. The forty-fifth heresy of the Photinians, came from Photinus. I previously said that he was one of our bishops in the sense that Judas Iscariot was one of our apostles. Photinus created his own retinue of followers. He taught in unison with Paul of Samosata that Christ was a most pure human being and that he began to exist after being born from Mary but claimed that the Holy Spirit had always existed. He differed from the forty-fourth heresy only in that he called his wicked band of followers after his own name. He was refuted at the council of Nicaea.

46. The forty-sixth heresy was started by Mani, who created the fellowship of Manicheans. This Mani, who was born in a city in Persia and who taught there that he was an apostle of God, also travelled to Greece. His Greek disciples decided to give the name of Mannicheus [i.e., double "n"] to their founder in order to avoid a similar word for "madness," and almost as if Mani was pouring out on them a heavenly

manna fundentem. Iste duo principia inter se diuersa et aduersa eademque aeterna et coaeterna, hoc est semper fuisse, composuit, duasque naturas atque substantias, boni scilicet et mali, sequens alios antiquos haereticos, opinatus est. Quarum inter se pugnam et commixtionem, et boni purgationem et boni quod purgari non poterit cum malo in aeternum damnationem secundum sua dogmata asseuerantes, multa fabulantur, quae cuncta intexere nimis longum est. Dicunt animas bonas et eiusdem cuius est deus esse naturae. Proinde mundum a natura boni, hoc est a natura dei factum confitentur quidem, sed de commixtione boni et mali, quae facta est quando inter se utraque natura pugnauit. Ipsam uero boni a malo purgationem ac liberationem non solum per totum mundum et de omnibus eius elementis uirtutes dei facere dicunt, uerum etiam electos suos per alimenta quae sumunt. Et eis quippe alimentis, sicut uniuerso mundo, dei substantiam perhibent esse commixtam, quam purgari putant in electis suis eo genere uitae quo uiuunt electi Manichaeorum, uelut sanctius et excellentius auditoribus suis. Nam his duabus professionibus, hoc est electorum et auditorum, ecclesiam suam constare uoluerunt. In ceteris autem hominibus, etiam in ipsis auditoribus suis, hanc partem bonae diuinaeque substantiae, quae maxime colligata in escis et potibus detinetur, maximeque in eis qui generant filios, arctius et inquinatius colligari putant. Quidquid uero undique purgatur luminis, per quasdam naues, quas esse lunam et solem uolunt, regno dei tamquam propriis sedibus reddi. Quas naues de substantia dei perhibent fabricatas, lucemque istam corpoream animantium mortalium oculis adiacentem dei dicunt esse naturam. Quinque enim elementa quae genuerunt principes proprios, genti tribuunt tenebrarum, eaque elementa his nominibus nuncupant: fumum, tenebras, ignem, aquam, uentum. In fumo nata animalia bipedia, unde homines ducere originem censem, in tenebris repentia, in igni quadrupedia, in aquis natatilia, in uento <uolatilia>. His quinque elementis malis alia quinque elementa de regno et substantia dei, esse dicunt, et in illa pugna fuisse permixta, fumo aerem, tenebris lucem, igni malo ignem bonum, aquae malae aquam bonam, uento malo uentum bonum. Naves autem illas, id est duo caeli luminaria, ita distinguunt ut lunam dicant factam ex bona aqua, solem uero ex igni bono. Esse autem in eis nauibus escas uirtutes, quae se in masculos transfigurant, ut illiciant feminas gentis aduersae, et per hanc illecebram commota eorum concupiscentia fugiat de illis lumen quod membris suis permixtum tenebant, et purgandum suscipiatur ab angelis lucis, purgatumque in illis nauibus imponatur ad regna propria reportandum. Qua occasione coguntur electi eorum uelut eucharistiam conspersam cum semine humano sumere, sicut de aliis cibis, ut substantia illa diuina purgetur. Sed hoc se dum facere negant, detecti sunt. Nam et apud ecclesiam

manna. Mani set up two principles, which are different and opposed to each other, both of them co-eternal, in other words, without a beginning. He also believed that there were two natures and substances, namely good and evil, following in this view other ancient heretics. As they uphold according to their beliefs the struggle and mutual interaction of these two principles, namely the purification of the good and the eternal damnation of the good that was not able to be purified from evil, they make up stories about many other things, which would take too long to describe.

They say that good souls are of the same nature as God's. Hence, they believe that the world comes from the nature of the good, meaning that it was made from God's nature, though it stems from the mixture of good and evil that came to be when both natures fought against each other. They say that the purification and liberation of good from evil is brought about not only through the entire world and from of all its elements by God's powers, but also by his Elect by means of the food they eat. They regard God's substance to be mixed in with those foods and with the entire world, a substance that they believe is purified in his Elect thanks to the particular lifestyle they have adopted, making them holier and better than the Auditors [of their sect]. In fact, they intended their church to consist of these two classes of people, namely the Elect and the Auditors. They reckon that this part of the good and divine substance, which for the most part is found in various foods and drinks, is found in a more compact and polluted way in all other people, even in their Auditors, and especially in those who generate children. They think that any light, anywhere in the world, once is purified, is restored to the kingdom of God as to its own proper place by means of certain ships, which they identify with the sun and the moon. They regard these ships to be made out of God's substance and claim that this physical light that comes in contact with the eyes of living mortal beings is also God's nature. They attribute to the class of darkness five elements, each generating its own ruler, and gave to each element the following names: smoke, darkness, fire, water and wind. They claim that two-legged animals were born in smoke, from whom human beings drew their origin; crawling creatures were born in darkness; quadrupeds, in fire; swimming beings, in water; and winged beings, in wind. They also say that in opposition to these five evil elements another five elements came into existence from God's kingdom and substance and in the [ensuing] struggle they eventually were mixed together: air with smoke; light with darkness; evil fire with good fire; good water with bad water; evil wind with good wind.

Manicheans make a distinction between those vessels, namely the two heavenly lights, so that they claim that the moon is made out of the good water, and the sun out of the good fire. They also allege that in those ships there are good powers acting like bait and that they are able to transform themselves into males in order to allure females of the inimical group. After their lust has been kindled by means of this enticement, the light that they contained and that was mixed in with their members allegedly escapes and is taken over by the angels of light in order to be purified; once purified, this light is loaded onto those ships in order to be taken back to their proper kingdoms.

On that occasion, their Elect are obliged to partake of a eucharist, if we may call it such, which is spattered with human semen, so that the special divine substance [that

Carthaginiensem ita sunt manifestati. Denique in conuentu epis coporum coram omni populo confessa est puella nondum annorum duodecim istam nefariam turpitudinem, et multa prodidit, se ipsam asserens ob hoc scelestum sacramentum eorum uim esse perpessam. Cui cum primo non crederetur uni puellae et soli, plurimas nominauit huius facinoris conscientias, quas solatio Vrsi tribuni, qui tunc domui regiae praefuit, de diuersis dominibus ubi latebra fouebantur electas a clericis ad ecclesiam Restitutam adductas, id ipsum propter hoc ipsum passas, uix et compulsas constat esse confessas. Tunc totum illud turpissimum scelus, ubi ad excipiendum et commiscendum concubentium semen farina substernitur, profertur in medium, et quod cum infinito rubore dicitur et auditur, recenti tempore nonnulli eorum ad ecclesiam adducti sunt, sicut gesta episcopalia ibidem confecta testantur. Tria ergo genera eorum sunt: Catharistae, Mattarii et Manichaei. Omnes tamen has tres formas ab uno magistro ipso scelerato Mani constat esse conscriptas. Omnes denique Manichaeum legunt, et omnes libri eius sunt eis sine dubitatione communes: in quibus libris agitur ut per concupiscentiam dissoluatur utriusque sexus princeps tenebrarum, et fugiat ab eis liberata diuina substantia, quam in hominis semine teneri existimant inquinatam, unde etiam Catharistae appellantur quasi purgatores. Qui cum carnes non comedant, tam polluti sunt ut cum omnibus suis etiam humanum semen assumant, cum nec oua ipsa accipiant. Aiunt enim: “et ipsa dum franguntur expirant.” Sed nec alimonia lactis utuntur, non quia putent diuinae substantiae nihil ibi esse permixtum, sed quia sibi error ipse non constat. Nam et uinum non bibunt, dicentes fel esse principis tenebrarum, et tamen uuas comedunt, cum de musto nec digitum intinctum assumant. Animas auditorum suorum in electos reuolui arbitrantur. Ceteras autem animas quae eorum non sunt auditorum, in pecora redire asserunt, et in omnia quae radicibus fixa sunt atque aluntur in terra. Herbas enim et arbores ita in eis uitam esse putant ut sentire ea, cum laeduntur, aestiment et dolere. Vnde et agriculturam, quae omnium artium est innocentior, tamquam plurimorum homicidiorum ream, dementes accusant, et praecipue cum agrum a spinis uiderint repurgari, suisque auditoribus ideo arbitrantur ignosci, quia praebent inde alimenta electis suis, ut diuina illa substantia in eorum uentre purgata impetreret eis ueniam, quorum traditur oblatione purganda. Itaque ipsi electi nihil in agris operantes nec poma carpentes nec folia ulla uellentes exspectant haec afferri usibus suis ab auditoribus suis, uiuentes tot ac tantis secundum suam uanitatem homicidiis alienis. Monent etiam eosdem auditores suos ut, si uestiuntur carnibus, animalia non occidant, ne offendant principes tenebrarum in caelestibus colligatos, a quibus omnem carnem dicunt originem ducere. Et sic utuntur coniugibus ut conceptum generationemque

is in them] may be purified by it as well as by the other types of food they consume. However, though they deny doing such a thing, they were eventually exposed; in fact, they were shown to engage in such practice in a church in Carthage. In fact, in a gathering of [our] bishops and before the entire population, a young girl who was not even twelve years old revealed this nefarious turpitude, claiming that she was raped in occasion of this wicked sacrament. Though at first there were doubts concerning the testimony of only one underage girl, she named several other women who she knew had been victims of this crime; the investigation of tribune Ursus, who at the time was in charge of the royal house, eventually caused other women to reluctantly admit that they too had been raped in occasion of and due to the same ceremony. These women had been kicked out of various homes and eventually were led to the church named *Restituta* by some priests, where they found a refuge. At that point, that most wicked crime, in which flour was spread [on the floor] to receive the semen of those laying on it and mixed with it, was finally revealed; this infamy was confessed and heard in utter shame when recently some of those people were brought into the church, as it was been reported in some written episcopal proceedings.

Thus, we distinguish three types of those people: the Cathars, the *Mattarii* (**h**) and the Manicheans. It turns out that these three categories were devised in writing by the same one teacher, the wicked Mani. All these people are Manicheans and without a doubt they have Mani's books in common; in those books it is argued that the prince of darkness is destroyed through the lust of both sexes and that the divine substance is freed and escapes from them, which they fancy to exist in a defiled state in man's semen, so that they are called Catharists, as if they were agents of purification. However, even though they do not eat any type of meat, they nonetheless become polluted when they eat with their associates even human semen; nor do they eat eggs, for they say: "They will die when they are broken." They also do not consume dairy products, not because they think that something is mixed in them with the divine substance, but because their mistaken belief is inconsistent. For they also do not drink wine saying that it is the bile of the prince of darkness; even though they eat grapes, they do not drink grape juice, and not even taste it by dipping their fingers in it.

Manicheans believe that the souls of their Auditors eventually return in the bodies of the Elect. They also claim that all the other souls that are not their Auditors' return in the bodies of cattle, and in all things that are planted and nourished on the earth through their roots. In fact, they believe that grass and trees have life in them and conclude that when they are hurt, they feel pain. These crazy people consider agriculture, which is the most innocent of all human arts, to be guilty of multiple homicides, especially when they see a field that has been cleared of thorn bushes. They believe that their Auditors are forgiven for such crimes because through such activities they are able to procure food for the Elect, so that the divine substance, once is purified in their bellies, asks for them to be forgiven, as it is offered by them to be purified. Therefore, the Elect themselves, who never do any work in the fields, who never pick up any fruit, and who never pick up any leaves, wait for these things to be gathered up by their Auditors for their own personal use, and believe in their deluded thoughts to be able to enjoy their lives without being guilty of the homicides that others commit [on their behalf]. For they warn their Auditors that if they decide

deuident, ne diuina substantia quae in eos per alimenta ingreditur, uinculis carneis ligetur in prole. Sic quippe in omnem carnem, id est per escas et potus, uenire animas credunt. Vnde et nuptias sine dubitatione condemnant et, quantum in ipsis est, prohibent generare, propter quod sunt copulanda coniugia. Adam et Euam ex principibus fumi asserunt natos, quorum pater, aiunt, nomine Saclas, quem sociorum suorum fetus omnium asserunt deuorasse, et quidquid inde commixtum diuinae substantiae ceperat, cum uxore concumbens in carne prolis tamquam tenacissimo uinculo colligasse. Christum autem fuisse affirmant quem dicit nostra scriptura serpentem, a quo illuminatos asserunt eorum aspectus, ut bonum malumque dignoscerent, eumque Christum nouissimis temporibus aduenisse ad animas, non ad corpora liberanda, nec fuisse in carne uera, sed simulatam speciem carnis ludificandis humanis sensibus praebuisse, ubi non solum mortem, uerum etiam resurrectionem similiter mentiretur. Deum qui legem per Moysen dedit et in Hebraeis prophetis locutus est, non esse uerum deum, sed unum ex principibus tenebrarum affirmant. Ipsiusque testamenti noui scripturas tamquam falsatas ita legunt ut quod uolunt inde accipient, quod nolunt reiant, eisque tamquam totum uerum habentes nonnullas apocryphas anteponunt. Promissionem domini nostri Iesu Christi de paracleto in suo haeresiarche Manichaeo dicunt esse completam. Vnde se ipse in suis litteris Iesu Christi apostolum dicit, eo quod Jesus Christus se eum missurum esse promiserit, et ideo eius apostolus, quia in eo missus sit spiritus sanctus. Propter quod etiam ipse Manichaeus duodecim discipulos habuit, instar apostolici numeri, quem numerum Manichaei hodieque custodiunt. Nam et ex electis suis habent duodecim quos appellant magistros et tertium decimum principem ipsorum, episcopos autem septuaginta duo qui ordinantur a magistris, et presbyteros, qui ordinantur ab episcopis, numeri indefiniti. Habent etiam episcopi diaconos. Iam ceteri tantummodo electi uocantur. Sed mittuntur etiam ipsi qui uidentur idonei ad hunc errorem, uel ubi est augmentandum uel ubi non est seminandum. Baptismum in aqua nihil cuiquam perhibent salutis afferre, nec quemquam eorum quos decipiunt baptizandos putant. Orationes faciunt ad solem per diem quaquaversum circuit, ad lunam per noctem si appareat, si autem non appareat, ad aquiloniam partem, qua sol cum occiderit ad orientem reuertitur. Stant orantes. Peccatorum autem originem non libero arbitrio uoluntatis, sed substantiae tribuunt gentis aduersae, quam dogmatizant esse hominibus mixtam. Omnem uero carnem non diuinitatis, sed malae mentis asserunt esse opificium, quae contrario deo coaeterna est. Carnalem concupiscentiam qua *caro concupiscit aduersus spiritum*, substantiam uolunt esse contrariam, sic nobis adhaerentem ut quando liberamur atque purgamur, iterum reparetur, et in sua

to eat meat, at least they should not kill animals in order not to offend the princes of darkness who are being kept prisoners in the heavenly realms and from whom they say all kinds of flesh originate. They also have intercourse with their spouses though they seek to avoid pregnancy and procreation, so that the divine substance that enters in them through food consumption may not be imprisoned by the bonds of the flesh in their progeny. For this is what they believe, namely that souls arrive in every mortal body through food and beverages. Hence, they condemn marriage without hesitation, and as far as they can, they prohibit bringing children into the world, which is the end of conjugal unions. They claim that Adam and Eve were born from the princes of smoke, whose father was an entity named Saclas, who they claim devoured the fetuses of his companions; and whatever mixture with the divine substance resulted from this, he firmly tied in the flesh of his progeny with a very strong bond as he laid down with his wife.

They claim that Christ was the serpent mentioned in our sacred scripture by whom [Adam and Eve] were enlightened so that they could distinguish between good and evil. They also say that that this Christ came in most recent times to free souls, not bodies; nor did he have true flesh, but displayed the appearance of flesh so as to deceive human senses, and consequently he simulated not only his death but his resurrection as well. They declare that the god who gave to the Jews the Law through Moses and spoke to them through the prophets is not the true God, but one of the princes of darkness. They read the scriptures of the New Testament as if they had been falsified, so that they pick and choose from them what they want and reject what they do not want; they also prefer to them some apocryphal texts, as if they contained the whole truth. They say that Jesus' promise concerning the coming of the Paraclete has been fulfilled in the person of their heresiarch, Mani. Hence, the latter claims to be the apostle of Jesus Christ in his letters because Jesus Christ promised he would have sent him, Mani, thus certifying him as his apostle in whom the Holy Spirit would have been sent. For this reason, Mani too had twelve disciples, like the number of the apostles, a number which Manicheans still preserve today. In fact, they have twelve people chosen from their Elect, whom they call teachers, and a thirteenth person as their leader; seventy-two bishops who are ordained by their teachers; and also an unspecified number of presbyters who are ordained by their bishops. These bishops also have deacons. All the others are merely called the "Elect." They also send as missionaries those whom they see fit to spread this error, either where it is necessary to increase it or where it needs to be sown for the first time. According to them, water baptism does not bring salvation to anyone, nor do they think they need to baptize those whom they convert. During the day they pray in the direction of the sun wherever it happens to be in the sky; at night they pray in the direction of the moon if it is visible; if it isn't, they look at the northern sky, through which the sun, after it sets, returns to the East. They pray standing up.

They attribute the origin of sins not to the choices of free will, but to the substance of the inimical group, which they declare to be mixed with human beings. They claim that every physical body is not the work of God, but of an evil mind which is opposite to and co-eternal with God. They believe that carnal concupiscence, due to which the flesh has opposite desires than those of the spirit, is an antithetical

natura etiam ipsa immortaliter uiuat. In uno homine duas dicunt animas esse et duas mentes, easque per naturam contrarias, bonas et malas, easque dicunt inter se habere conflictum. Finito autem isto saeculo post conflagrationem mundi istam substantiam mali in globo quodam dicunt tamquam in carcere esse uicturam, cui globo affirmant accessurum et semper adhaesurum et quasi cooptorium atque tectorium ex animabus natura quidem bonis, sed tamen quae non potuerint a naturae malae contagione mundari.

XLVII. Quadragesimus septimus haereticus Hieracha hieracitas instituit. Hi resurrectionem carnis negant. Monachos tantum et monachas, et eos qui coniugia non habent, in communione recipiunt. Ad regnum caelorum non pertinere paruulos dicunt, quia non sunt eis merita ulla certaminis quo uitia superantur. Contra hunc suscepit sanctus Aphrodisius Helleponsi episcopus, asserens resurrectionem carnis et nouo et ueteri testamento esse firmatam. Infantes autem iam homines esse, et sicut si quis eos occidat, homicidae suscipit crimen, sic qui eos baptimate consecrauerit, mercedem sibi de hominis salute acquirit. Communionem nulli negandam, nisi his qui praetermissis coniugibus propriis alienas requirunt.

XLVIII. Quadragesima octaua haeresis est Meletianorum a Meletio quodam. Nolentes orare cum his qui in persecutione ceciderant, schisma fecerunt. Quibus restitit sanctus Basilius episcopus Cappadociae, dicens maiorem spei et fidei caritatem quae omnia tolerat, et manum lapsis magis porrigidam. Hortatur etiam desperantes recuperatione prouocandos ut redeant: siquidem etiam angelis *in caelo gaudium faciat unus paenitens, quam nonaginta nouem qui non peccauerunt.*

XLIX. Quadragesimus et nonus haeresiarches Arrius ortus est. Hic populos Arrianos instituit, qui patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum nolunt esse unius eiusdemque substantiae, sed esse filium creaturam, spiritum uero sanctum creaturam creaturae, hoc est ab ipso filio creatum uolunt. In eo autem quod Christum sine anima carnem suscepisse arbitrantur, Epiphanius prodidit. Et ideo patrem maiorem filii sic dicit quasi creatorem, et filium maiorem spiritui sancto quasi creatorem eius. Nostros, id est catholicos, ad se uenientes rebaptizant. Vtrum hoc etiam aliis, id est non catholicis, faciant, nusquam legitur. Primus contra hos suscepit sanctus Hesiodus episcopus Corinthiorum, uir qui etiam mortuos suscitasse asseritur. Vnde factum est ut plus sanctitatem quam disputationem attendentes homines Arrium exsecrarentur. Siquidem eius orationibus asseritur ipse Arrius in secessum sedens uniuersa simul interanea cum stercoribus

substance which adheres to us in such a way that even when we are freed and purified from it, it is able to renew itself and remain alive in its own nature forever. They say that there are two souls and two minds in every person, one good and the other bad due to their opposite natures, and that they wage war against each other. At the end of our times, following a conflagration of the world, this evil substance will be made to reside inside a sphere as if in a prison; this sphere will be covered, as if forming a roof, with souls that are good as far as their nature is concerned, but that were nonetheless unable to be purified from the pollution inherited from their contact with evil nature.

47. The forty-seventh heretic Hieracha, gave rise to the heresy of the Hierachites, who deny the resurrection of the body. They welcome in their fellowship only monks, nuns and unmarried people. They say that the kingdom of heaven does not pertain to children because they do not have any merits that are acquired through the struggle by which vices are vanquished. Saint Aphrodisius, bishop of Hellespont, took them on, as he claimed that the resurrection of the body is firmly upheld in both the New and the Old Testament. Aphrodisius also taught that children are to be regarded as adults, when we consider the fact that a person who kills another one is guilty of a crime, and also that anyone who consecrated them in baptism deserves for themselves the [heavenly] reward for saving a human being. They do not deny communion to anyone except to those who, having set aside intercourse with their own spouses, engage in intercourse with other people.

48. The forty-eight heresy is that of the Meletians, founded by a certain Meletius. (i) As they refused to pray together with those who lapsed during a persecution, they started a schism. They were opposed by St Basil, bishop of Cappadocia, as he said that love is greater than hope and faith, since it endures all things, and that fellowship should be extended to those who lapsed. He preached that those who despair of being forgiven must be encouraged so that they may return to the fold: in fact, a person who repents gives more joy to the angels in heaven than ninety-nine people who did not sin.<sup>16</sup>

49. The forty-ninth heresy arose due to the heresiarch Arius. He gave birth to the Arian party, which denies that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are of the same one substance. Instead, they believe that the Son is a creature, and that the Spirit is the creation of a creature, in other words, that it was created by the Son. Epiphanius also related that they believe that Christ received a mortal body without a soul. Therefore, Arius claims that the Father is greater than the Son in virtue of being his creator, and that the Son is greater than the Holy Spirit as if he was his creator. Arians re-baptize our people, namely those Catholics who join their ranks, though nowhere do we read about them doing the same with non-Catholics. The first to rise against their challenge was the holy bishop of the Corinthians, Hesiod, a man who was also credited for rising the dead; thus, what happened was that people came to detest Arius, having been won over more by his holiness than by attending his arguments. It is said, if that's even possible, that as a result of Hesiod's prayers, the very Arius

---

<sup>16</sup> Lk 15:7.

profudisse. Iam contra sectam eius tam orientales quam etiam occidentales episcopi scripserunt, quibus eum per singula capita dogmatum suorum asserunt blasphemantem.

L. Quinquagesimos Valdianos memorat Epiphanius, non quidem haereticos, sed schismaticos, quos alii anthropomorphitas uocant, quoniam deum sibi fingunt cogitatione carnali in similitudine imaginis corruptibilis hominis dicentes: *oculi domini super iustos; caelos opera datorum dei; et deus sedet super sedem sanctam suam;* et: *deus stetit in synagoga deorum,* et cetera quae possunt de uisibili cogitari. Quia ergo in nullo alio errant, mitius eos agens Epiphanius noluit haereticos nominare, dans ueniam rusticitati. Quod autem nobis non communicant, diuitias habere nostros episcopos clamant quas Christus etiam laicos contemnere iubet. Pascha cum Iudeis celebrant. Egit contra hos Zenon Syrorum episcopus.

LI. Quinquagesima prima haeresis Eunomianorum ab Eunomio. Hi serpentis antiqui spiritu pleni, non solum minorem filium, sed nec similis essentiae esse filium asseuerant. Egit contra hos Ammonius presbyter.

LII. Quinquagesima secunda haeresis Macedonianorum a Macedonio. Hos pneumatomachos appellant per orientem nostri, eo quod de spiritu sancto litigent. Nam de patre et filio recte sentiunt, spiritum uero sanctum nolunt credere deum, creaturam eum dicentes. Philaster scribit Macedonium spiritum sanctum deitatem patris et filii dicere: quo dicto uidetur proprietatem suam sancto spiritui denegare. Egit contra hos synodus Nicaena.

LIII. Quinquagesima et tertia haeresis Arianorum ab Aorio quodam, qui cum esset presbyter, doluisse fertur quod non esset episcopus ordinatus. Coepit docere non debere pro dormientibus offerri, nec statuta celebranda esse ieunia, sed, cum quisque uoluerit, ieunandum, ne uideatur esse sub lege. Presbyterum ab episcopo nulla differentia debere discerni, et non admitti ad communionem suam, nisi a coniugio abstinentes.

LIV. Quinquagesima et quarta haeresis Aetiana ab Aetio uocata. Hi cum Eunomio dissimilem per omnia patri filium confitentur, et dicunt: “quicumque nostrae fidei consentiunt, sciant sibi nulla obesse peccata quaecumque ab eis fuerint perpetrata.” Contra hos synodus uiginti episcoporum egit in Achaia.

LV. Quinquagesima et quinta haeresis Apollinaristarum est ab Apollinare inchoata. Negant hominem perfectum in Christo, sed assumptionem carnis ita factam ut intus in homine pro anima

poured out his intestines together with his feces as he squatted by the side of the road [to relieve himself]. Both Eastern and Western bishops wrote against this sect, as they claimed that he blasphemed in each and every one his beliefs.

50. Epiphanius lists the Audians as the fiftieth example of departure from the faith, though he calls them schismatics and not heretics. Other people also called them Anthropomorphites, because in their carnal way of thinking they imagine God to be similar to the image of corruptible human beings, as they quote from Scriptures: *For the eyes of the Lord are on the righteous and his ears turned to their prayer but the face of the Lord is against evildoers;*<sup>17</sup> *Your heavens are the work of Your fingers;*<sup>18</sup> *God takes a stand in the divine council, gives judgment in the midst of the gods;*<sup>19</sup> and similar texts that can be thought to refer to visible things. However, since they do not err in any other things, Epiphanius, dealing with them in a milder manner, declined to call them heretics, merely faulting them with lack of sophistication. These people do not associate with us, claiming that our bishops enjoy riches that Christ himself commanded his followers to despise. They celebrate Easter the same day Jews do. The Syrian bishop Zeno spoke against them.

51. The fifty-first heresy is that of the Eunomians, who take their name from [bishop] Eunomius. Being filled with the [malicious] spirit of the serpent of old, they claim that not only the Son is inferior to the Father, but also that he is not similar to his essence. The presbyter Ammonius rose up against them.

52. The fifty-second heresy of the Macedonians derives from Macedonius. Our people call them Pneumatomachians in the East because they argue [with us] about the Holy Spirit. Although they hold correct views about the Father and the Son, they refuse to believe that the Spirit is God, saying that it is [merely] a creature. Philastrius wrote that according to Macedonius the holy spirit is the divine condition of the Father and of the Son; judging by this, it seems that they denied the personal existence of the Holy Spirit. The Council of Nicaea acted against them.

53. The fifty-third heresy is the heresy of the Aerians, named after a certain Aerianus, who, though being a presbyter, was bitter for not having been ordained a bishop, or so the rumor goes. He began to teach that no masses should be offered for the dead, and that prescribed fasts should not be publicly celebrated but that the decision to when to fast was up to each person, so that it wouldn't seem as if we were still living under the Law. He also claimed that no difference should be noted between a presbyter and a bishop, and he did not admit to his fellowship married couples unless they abstained from sex.

54. The fifty-fourth heresy is called Aetiana from Aetius. His followers confess with Eunomius that the Son is dissimilar in all things from the Father and say that “Let anyone who agrees with our faith be aware that no sins at all can hurt them, no matter what sins were committed.” A synod of twenty bishops acted against them in Achaia.

55. The fifty-fifth heresy of the Apollinarists came from Apollinaris. They deny that there was a perfect man in Christ but claim that his assuming flesh was such that

---

<sup>17</sup> 1 Pt 3:12.

<sup>18</sup> Ps 8:4.

<sup>19</sup> Ps 82:1.

diuinitas esset. Carnem autem et uerbum unius eiusdemque uoluit docere substantiae. Contentiosissime asserentes: *uerbum caro factum est*, uolunt docere aliquid de uerbo in carne conuersum. Insuper etiam de Mariae carne nihil esse susceptum in incarnatione domini nostri Iesu Christi confirmant. Egit contra hunc synodus in Antiochia.

LVI. In quinquagesima sexta haeresi Antidicomaritae appellati sunt haeretici, qui Mariae uirginitati usque adeo contradicunt ut affirment eam post Christum natum uiro fuisse commixtam. Egit contra hos Theodosius Cyprius episcopus.

LVII. Quinquagesimam et septimam haeresim Messalianorum inuenimus, quod nomen ex lingua Syra est, Graece autem dicuntur Euchitae, ab orando sic appellati. Non psallunt, iugiter orant. Sed quia hoc solum faciunt, non habentes caritatem nec alloquii nec humanitatis, inter haereticos sunt a sancta synodo confutati. Condemnant etiam eos monachos qui aliud, praeter legendi orandique opera, aliquid fuerint operati uel artis uel agriculturae. Vsque ad istos Epiphanius peruenit et siluit. Credo eum usque ad id temporis uixisse. Praeterita enim et praesentia indicare humana curiositas potest. Deus autem solus potest futura praedicere. Verum quia Philaster iam suis et ipse libris quibus diuersorum retexit historias, etiam haereses quae ortae fuerint ceteris quibusque temporibus, ex eius nunc libris disserendo solas haereses in medium exhibemus. Egit contra hos Ephrem presbyter Syrorum.

LVIII. Quinquagesimam et octauam haeresim Metangismonitae inchoauerunt. Αγγεῖον Graeco sermone uas dicitur, μεταγγισμός autem uas intra uas aduertitur. Ex isto ergo articulo hoc sibi nomen assumunt dicentes: “sic est filius in patre quomodo uas minus intra uas maius.” Quos ideo repudiat ecclesia, quia de incorporeo carnaliter sentiunt, et de incomprensibili liniatis agunt, et de aequalitate diuinitatis gradus statuunt. Egit contra hos Diodorus episcopus Nicomediae.

LIX. In quinquagesima et nona haeresi Seleuciani sunt orti a Seleuco: qui elementorum materiam de qua factus est mundus, non a deo factam dicunt, sed deo coaeternam, nec animam deo tribuunt creatori, sed creatores esse animarum angelos uolunt de igni et de spiritu. Malum autem asserunt esse aliquando a deo, aliquando a materia. Negant saluatorem in carne sedere ad dexteram patris, sed ea se exuisse perhibent eamque in sole posuisse, accipientes occasionem de psalmo ubi legitur: *in sole posuit tabernaculum suum*. Negant uisibilem paradisum, baptismum in aqua non accipiunt, resurrectionem non credunt futuram, sed quotidie asserunt in generatione filiorum. Hos non admittit disciplina fidei nostrae nobis cum disceptationem assumere, sed pro definitionibus suis eos paecepit anathemati mancipari.

within his humanity the deity was present in place of a [rational] soul. Apollinaris emphasized that Christ's flesh and the Word were of the same one substance. These heretics claim in a very argumentative fashion that "*The Word became flesh*," in other words, that nothing proper of the Word was changed when it took on human flesh, and in addition they declare that nothing from Mary's flesh was assumed in the course of the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. A synod in Antiochia condemned them.

56. The fifty-sixth heresy is that of the Antidicomarianites who have this name because they deny Mary's perpetual virginity and claim that she had relations with Joseph after Jesus was born. Theodosius, bishop of Cyprus, spoke up against them.

57. The fifty-seventh heresy of the Messalians drew its name from the Syrian language; in Greek they are called Euchites, from the verb "to pray." They do not sing the Psalms but pray constantly. Since they only do this, without displaying any charitable spirit in words or actions, they were refuted as heretics by a holy synod. Likewise, they also condemn those monks who, besides reading the Scriptures or praying, engage in any other art or practice agriculture. Epiphanius, when it came to these heretics had nothing to say; I believe [this was the case because] he only lived up to their time. Human curiosity can only entertain past and present events, but only God is able to predict the future. Indeed, because Philastrius himself in his own books recounted the history of different heresies, including those that arose in other times, we will now discuss only those that he mentioned in his writings by selecting some. The Syrian presbyter Ephrem criticized them.

58. The fifty-eight heresy is that of the Metangismonites. Their name comes from the Greek words *αγγειον*, meaning "vessel," and *μεταγγισμός*, evoking the image of a vessel inside another one. In fact, they chose this name for themselves as they claim that "the Son is in the Father, in the same way a smaller vessel is contained in a larger one." The Church rejected them because they think about incorporeal, spiritual reality in a materialistic way; they talk casually about incomprehensible mysteries; and establish different degrees within the deity instead of acknowledging equality. Bishop Diodorus of Nicodemia denounced them.

59. In the fifty-ninth heresy, the Seleucians were founded by Seleucus. They claim that the matter of the elements out of which the world is made of, was not created by God, but rather is coeternal with him, nor do they attribute the existence of souls to the Creator but insist that angels made them out of fire and spirit. They also claim that evil sometimes originates from God, and other times from matter. They deny that the Savior sits at the right hand of the Father in his human flesh, but claim that he shed his human nature and placed it in the sun, taking their clue from Ps 19:4: *He placed his tabernacle in the sun.* (j) These heretics deny a visible paradise; they do not practice water baptism; (k) and finally, they do not believe in the future resurrection but say instead that it takes place in everyday life through the generation of children. The discipline of our faith does not permit us to engage them in a discussion, but rather orders us to anathemize them for their beliefs.

LX. Sexagesimam haeresim Proclianistae a Proclino fecerunt. Dicunt isti dei filium sic paruisse in terris, sicut Raphaelem angelum aut Gabrielem, non carne assumpta, sed uisa. Sic se miscent populo dei ut non intelligantur. Denique quia nullum alium errorem patiuntur, communicant nobis cum. Et hoc est quod peius est, quia quoscumque simplices inuenerint, ita eos faciunt sentire et credere. Hoc scelus ualde inimicum salutis nostrae ita astruunt: “ergo deus illas sordes habuit sustinere quas naturalis conceptio partus et parientis infligit? Habuitque dei filius habere aluum de gesta sua abluentem, humorem de naribus, saliuam ex ore, sordem in aure, in uentre stercora, putorem in exhalatione?,” et his similia, quae insania mentis excogitat. His Tertullianus uehementer occurrit, ostendens dei filium impassibilem esse, et ista diuinitati non iniuriam, sed laudem afferre: “sicut rex, qui uolens anulum aureum cum gemma de cloaca leuare, induit se seruilem tunicam et sic descendit ad cloacam ut stercoreas iniurias tunica illa suscipiat, et mittens manum et anulum aureum cum gemma eripiens, aqua abluit et digito suo regali induit, posteaquam inde ascenderit, ita procul dubio dei filius *formam serui suscipiens*, uenit non solum ad inferos caelorum, ubi nos sumus qui uidemur uiuere in mundo, sed etiam ad inferos inferiores, qui tanto a nobis sunt profundius quanto nos sumus caelo, et ut inde humanum genus eriperet, cunctarum sordium non suarum, sed nostrarum est squalore perpessus. Pro uiuentibus sic uixit sicut nos qui uiuimus, nihil aliud distans, nisi hoc quod immaculatam uitam exercuit, habens intra se deum. Pro mortuis sic mortuus, nihil distans, nisi hoc quod tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, et quod propterea sic descendit ut sanctos inde erueret et mortis principem religaret.” Quod autem anulum aureum cum gemma posuit, hoc in sequenti lectione edocuit, quod anulum corpus posuerit, gemmam uero in anulo inclusam esse animam declarauit. Hunc ergo anulum de stercoribus antiquis et de cloaca huius mundi Christus eleuans ac baptismatis unda perfundens, ab omni squalore abluens, in suis fecit sanctis manibus radiare. Siquidem ita legitur: *iustorum autem animae in manu dei sunt*. Et iterum: *pone me sicut anulum in manu tua*. Et: *in manus tuas commendabo spiritum meum*. Et infinita sunt his similia in sacris apicibus, quae nos causa breuitatis omittentes, ad sexagesimam et primam haeresim accedamus.

LXI. Sexagesimam et primam haeresim Patriciani fecerunt, a Patricio sumentes exordium. Hi substantiam carnis humanae non a deo, sed a diabolo conditam dicunt, eamque sic detestantur ut

60. The Procliniianites upheld their heresy by following Proclinius. They say that the Son of God appeared on this earth the way the angels Raphael and Gabriel did, in the sense that they did not assume human flesh, but only appeared to have done so. These people mingle with the rest of God's people so as not to be discovered. Since they are not guilty of any other error, they make common cause with us, and yet this is unfortunate because whenever they find simple-minded people they persuade them to feel and think the way they do. They uphold their impious views which are very much inimical to our salvation by saying: "Are you saying that God had to endure the indignity that natural birth through a vaginal canal inflicts on a mother? Did the Son of God have to excrete what ended up in his stomach, blow his nose, spit saliva from his mouth, clean cerumen from his ears and have bad breath?" They also list several other things similar to these, which their deranged minds come up with. Tertullian vigorously opposed them, making clear that the Son of God is impassible and that these things do not diminish his deity, but rather bring him praise. Tertullian said: "It's just like a king, who wishing to pick up a golden ring with an embedded jewel from a sewer decides to put on a servant's tunic. Then, he lowers himself into the sewer so that such cloak may get soiled with excrements [rather than his royal garb], and using his hand snatches the ring. After that, as soon as he climbs out the sewer, he washes his hand and puts the ring back on his royal finger. In a similar way, there is no doubt whatsoever that Son of God, *taking the form of a slave*,<sup>20</sup> not only descended from the heavens to the lower regions, where we who live in the world live out our existence, but also to hell, which is as distant from us as the heavens, in order to rescue humankind, and was plagued by the squalor of all kinds of filth typical of our condition, not his. He lived among us, human beings, for our sake, just like one of us, with no other difference than he lived a spotless life, having God within. He died for the sake of all dead people, with no other difference than on the third day he rose again; in virtue of his descent to hell he snatched away his saints and shackled the prince of death." Now, in regard to the analogy of the golden ring with a precious stone embedded on it, [Tertullian] consequently taught that the ring represents the [king's] body, and also claimed that the gem attached to it is the [king's]soul. Thus, Christ, by lifting this ring out of the ancient contaminations and from the sewer of this world, and by effusing the water of baptism and by cleansing it from every pollution, made this ring shine in his holy hands. Accordingly, we read: *The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God*,<sup>21</sup> and also: *Place me like a ring in your hand*; (I) and *Into your hands I commend my spirit*.<sup>22</sup> (m) There are countless similar passages in the sacred scriptures which I will omit for the sake of brevity in order to turn to the next heresy, which is the sixty-first.

61. The Patricians form the sixty-first heresy, as they originated from Patricius. These people say that the substance of human flesh was not created by God, but by the devil, and they detest it so much that they claim that a perfect person is one

---

<sup>20</sup> Phil 2:7.

<sup>21</sup> Wis 3:1.

<sup>22</sup> Ps 31:6.

hunc dicant esse perfectum qui se potuerit constanter occidere. Ex his sunt aliquanti qui etiam rogant eos quos inuenient ignotos ut ab eis occidantur. Haec insania in partibus Numidiae superioris et Mauritaniae coepit olim. Et hos miseri Donatistae postea secuti, coeperunt se montis praecipitio quasi futuri martyres tradere, ut qui uitam aeternam catholicae fidei derelinquent, ui anathematis aeternam mortem inueniant. Contra hos Optatus legitur egisse.

LXII. Sexagesima secunda haeresis Ascitarum est. Ascitae ergo ab utre appellantur. Ἀσκός enim Graece uter dicitur. Isti, cum in trinitate nihil mali habeant, utrem tamen ingentem iuxta altare ponunt, eumque uacuum inflant, et linteaminibus uelant et adorant, quia confectum crux domini ibi adiciunt, illud dicentes euangelicum: *uinum nouum in utres nouos adiciunt, et utraque conseruantur.*

LXIII. Sexagesima et tertia haeresis est Passalorynchitae. Omnes, quando ad ecclesiam suam conueniunt, tanto silentio student ut et naribus et labiis suis digitum apponant, ne uel ipsam taciturnitatem flatibus laedant. Cur autem per palum digitum significare maluerint a quibus hoc nomen compositum est nescio, cum Graece πάσσαλος palus dicatur, et digitus δάκτυλος, et ρύγχος nasus. Melius autem mihi uidetur si Dactylorynchitae uocentur. Inuenit sibi diabolus in lege dei quo faceret Pythagoras, illud obseruantes apostoli: *orabo spiritu, orabo et mente. Psalmum dicam spiritu, psalmum dicam et mente.* Docent ergo homines foras ecclesiam quid dicant in cordibus suis intra ecclesiam positi, quasi non idem apostolus dixerit: *corde creditur ad iustitiam, ore autem confessio fit in salutem.* Vanum dico ego eum laborem arripere, qui dignatur talibus respondendo tempus consumere, iustumque iudico ut tacentes tacendo uincamus.

LXIV. Sexagesima quarta haeresis Aquariorum, qui ex hoc appellati sunt Aquarii, quod aquam offerunt in poculo sacramenti. Dicunt enim uinum ebrietatis esse rem, per quam homicidia et fornicationes et cetera sclera perpetrantur. Cum constet omnia excedentia modum crimen facere, et uitium procreare, non ergo uini haustu, sed nimietate crimina committuntur. Quid est enim quod nimis sumptum non culpam incurrat? Bibatur nimis aqua, uideamus si non laedat. Comedatur nimius panis, uideamus si non crapulam faciat. Optimum ergo in rebus omnibus modum tenentes, etiam hos anathematizamus, cur crux Christi a fonte separantes praeiudicio fornicatorum et homicidarum, regulam a Christo fundatam audacter infringant.

LXV. Sexagesima quinta haeresis Coluthianorum a quodam Colutho emersit. Hi dicunt deum creasse mala et bona, secundum litteram sentientes quod dicitur: *ego deus creans mala et faciens*

who can calmly kill himself/herself. A number of them go as far as begging perfect strangers they encounter to kill them. This insanity originated in the past in some regions of upper Numidia and Mauritania. The wretched Donatists, after following them, began to jump from top of the mountains, acting like martyrs wannabes; thus, those who abandoned the eternal life found in the Catholic faith found eternal damnation instead, in virtue of the [Church's] anathema. We read that Optatus acted against them.

62. The sixty-second heresy is that of the Ascites, who take their name from the Greek word *ασκός*, meaning “goatskin.” These people do not say anything wrong about the Trinity but place a huge goatskin container close to the altar and blow it up; then they cover it with linen cloths and pay homage to it, having filled it with the Lord’s blood, recalling the Gospel saying: *New wine must be poured into fresh wineskins: this way they will both be preserved.*<sup>23</sup>

63. The sixty-third heresy is that of the Passalorynchites. When they gather in their church, they strive to apply silence so much that they put a finger before their noses and lips so as not to break their silence with their voices. I have no idea why those who came up with this name preferred “pole-finger,” since in Greek *πάσσαλος* means “pole,” *δάκτυλος* “finger,” and *πίς* “nose.” It seems to me that it would have been better to call themselves Dactilorinchites. The devil found in God’s Word [a justification for] what Pythagoras used to do, as the apostles also observed silence: *I will pray with the spirit, but I will also pray with the mind. I will sing praise with the spirit, but I will also sing praise with the mind.*<sup>24</sup> Therefore, when these people are outside the church buildings they teach what they would say in their hearts when they were inside, as if the apostle himself did not say: *For one believes with the heart and so is justified, and one confesses with the mouth and so is saved.*<sup>25</sup> I say that it is pointless to engage them in a detailed refutation because it would be time consuming; thus it is better to overcome them by remaining silent. (n)

64. The sixty-fourth heresy is that of the Aquarians, who are called this way because they offer water [as an oblation] in the cup of the eucharistic sacrament. They claim that wine is the cause of drunkenness, which is the reason why murders, fornications and other crimes are perpetrated. Though we agree that all kinds of excesses engender various offenses and cause sins, such deeds are perpetrated not by drinking wine per se, but by over-indulgence. For what does not create a problem if taken in abundance? If too much bread is eaten, let us see if it does not cause indigestion! As we maintain a proper balance in all things, we anathemize these people too, because by separating the blood of Christ from its source, as they adduce the example of sinners and murderers, they impudently break the rule founded by Christ.

65. The sixty-fifth heresy of the Colluthians arose because of a certain Colluthus. These people say that God created good and evil things, as they took the scriptural

<sup>23</sup> Lk 5:38; Mt 9:17.

<sup>24</sup> 1 Cor 14:15.

<sup>25</sup> Rom 10:10.

*bona.* Cum deus hoc per prophetam promiserit, quod faceret eos sine gladio hostium uiuere, et faceret terram dare germen suum abundantiamque omnium frugum, si eius mandata seruassent, si uero praeuaricatores essent, gladium et famem paterentur, et his dictis adiunxerit: *ego deus creans mala et faciens bona.* Illi hoc ad substantiam ab specie transferentes, malorum deum asserunt creatorem, cum creatura nulla sit mala. Possunt, ut uideo, deum blasphemare peruersum quia dicit ad populum: *si ambulaueritis recti, et ego uobis cum ambulabo rectus. Si autem ambulaueritis peruersi, et ego incedam uobis cum peruersus.*

LXVI. Sexagesima sexta haeresis Florianorum a Floriano, qui dicit malas animas et bonas a deo creari. “Ideo, inquit, qui malitiosi sunt, mali sunt, et non mutantur, et boni simpliciter uiuentes non in audaciam iniquorum hominum protrahuntur.” Quod dictum a Theodoro breuiter uincitur ita: Iudas bonus fuit, et factus est traditor, ipso tempore quo meretrix pessima lacrimis rigabat pedes eius, misericordiam quaerens. Si animam malam habuit mulier, quare in meretricio crimine tantum tempore perdurauit? Constat ergo animas bonas a deo conditas, quibus per naturam hoc inesse creator indulxit, ut cum sint bonae, non solum actu suo meliorentur, sed etiam in ipsa possint malignitate conuerti, dum illud diligentia inuenit, hoc incurrit negligentia.

LXVII. Sexagesima et septima haeresis est Satannianorum a Satannio. Hi dicunt post resurrectionem mortuorum in eodem statu in quo nunc sumus nos esse mansuros neque ita esse mutandos, ut sit *caelum nouum et terra noua*, sicut sancta scriptura promittit. Contra hos utriusque testamenti scripta luctantur.

LXVIII. Sexagesima et octaua haeresis est Gymnopodarum. Hi nudis pedibus semper ambulant, eo quod dixerit dominus ad Moysen: *solute calceamentum de pedibus tuis*, et quod sanctus Isaias legitur nudis pedibus ambulasse. Ideo hi schisma faciunt quoniam calceatos condemnant.

LXIX. In sexagesimam et nonam haeresim Donatistae a Donato exorti sunt, qui propter ordinatum contra suam uoluntatem Caecilium, ecclesiae Carthaginiensis episcopum, schisma fecerunt obientes ei crimina non probata, et maxime quod a traditoribus diuinorum scripturarum fuerit ordinatus. At ubi hinc mentiri conuicti sunt, schisma in haeresim conuerterunt. Quasi etiam si uera fuissent crimina in Caeciliiano, statum suum de toto orbe terrarum ecclesia amittere potuisset propter unius hominis culpam seu ueram, seu, quod magis apparuit iudicibus, falsam, et in parte Africana solus Donatus potuerit statum ecclesiae conseruare, de toto autem orbe terrarum sit deletus

passage literally: *I make weal and create woe.*<sup>26</sup> God indeed promised this to the prophet [Isaiah], that he would allow his people to live free of the threat of the sword of their enemies and that the earth would produce an abundance of buds of all types of crops if only they would observe his commandments, but also that they would suffer from violence and hunger if they turned out to be transgressors. After saying these things, Isaiah added: *I make weal and create woe.* These heretics, shifting from species to substance claim that God is the creator of evil things, even though no creature is evil per se. They also blame God as evil in a blasphemous way because he said to the people: “If you walk in righteousness, I will act rightly towards you, but if you walk in unrighteousness, I will cause you great harm.”<sup>27</sup>

66. The sixty-sixth heresy of the Floriani takes its name from Florianus, who says that good and evil souls were created as such by God: “Thus, those who are wicked are really evil and never change, while good people, as they lead simple lives are not drawn into the recklessness of evil people.” What Theodorus said [in response to this view] can be summarized in this way: Judas was created good but became a traitor just as [on the contrary] the corrupt prostitute shed tears on Jesus’ feet, begging for mercy. If this woman had an evil soul, why did she not continue in the evil exercise of prostitution after that? It is therefore evident that souls have been created good by God, so that, being good, not only they may improve by making good choices, but also so that they may be converted from the evil they do: therefore, in the former case we find diligence, while in the latter case we find negligence.

67. The sixty-seventh heresy of the Satannarii derives from Satannius. They say that after the resurrection of the dead we will remain in the same exact state we are in now, and that we will not change as Scripture promises when it talks about *new heavens and a new earth.*<sup>28</sup> The writings of both Testaments contradict them.

68. The sixty-eight heresy is that of the Gymnopedies who always walk barefooted because of what the Lord told Moses: *Remove your sandals from your feet.*<sup>29</sup> and because of what we read in Isaiah: *He walked barefoot.*<sup>30</sup> These people created a schism because they condemned people for wearing shoes.

69. The sixty-ninth heresy of the Donatists arose from [bishop] Donatus. These people, after Caecilianus was ordained bishop of the church of Carthage against their wishes, created a schism as they accused him of unsubstantiated crimes, and most of all [deploring the fact that] that he was ordained by people who surrendered the divine scriptures [to the Roman authorities]. But even after they were proven guilty of lying in their accusations, they turned their schism into a full-fledged heresy. These

---

<sup>26</sup> Is 47:5.

<sup>27</sup> Lev 26.

<sup>28</sup> Is 65:17.

<sup>29</sup> Ex 3:5.

<sup>30</sup> Is 20:2.

sanctorum apostolorum labor et passio martyrum. Immo ipse  
 saluatoris nostri cruor ad conseruandum coetum catholicae  
 fidei defecit, quem solus Donatus cum aliquantis asellionibus  
 Byzacenis obtinuit. Et ideo ausi sunt rebaptizare catholicos. In  
 quo opere et praesumptores se et damnabiles comprobarunt,  
 cum ecclesiae uniuersali sciant placuisse nec in ipsis haereticis  
 baptismatis uiolare uirtutem. Huius haeresis principem  
 legimus Donatum, qui de Numidia ueniens Carthaginem,  
 et contra Caecilianum Christi diuidens plebem, adiungens  
 sibi eiusdem factionis episcopos, Maiorinum nomine in sua  
 parte apud Carthaginem ordinauit episcopum. Cui Maiorino  
 Donatus aliis in eadem diuisione successit, qui eloquentia  
 sua sic confirmauit hanc haeresim ut multi existiment de ipso  
 potius Donatistas initium haereseos assumpsisse. Exstant  
 hodie scripta eius, ubi probatur in trinitate contra fidem  
 catholicam suscepisse. Et quamuis unius substantiae dicat in  
 trinitate deum patrem, tamen maiorem filio, filium maiorem  
 spiritui sancto confirmare temptauit. Sed in hunc errorem  
 ideo nullus de populo eius attendit, quia alia erat intentio inter  
 partes. Hi haeretici in partibus Italiae Montes appellantur,  
 in interiore Africa Parmeniani, in Carthaginiensi Donatistae.  
 In utriusque Numidiae partibus habent ueluti monachos,  
 quos Circumcelliones uocamus, agrestes et audacissimos  
 daemonum famulos, qui non solum in alios acriter saeuunt,  
 uerum etiam sibi ipsis miseri omnino non parcunt. Nam per  
 mortes uarias, maximeque praecipitorum et aquarum et ignium,  
 sese interficere consuerunt, et ad hunc exitium ex utroque sexu  
 quantos potuerint seducunt. Aliquando etiam quos inuenerint  
 rogant ut ab eis occidantur, mortem nisi fecerint comminantes.  
 Quod uerum est, multis Donatistarum displicant tales, sed hoc  
 uerbo, non opere. Nam si uere displicerent, utique talibus non  
 communicarent, qui per totum orbem ecclesiis unius Caeciliiani  
 crimen impingunt. Nam et inter se frequenter habuere dissidia.  
 Denique apud Carthaginem temporibus Heracliani comitis,  
 cum Maximianus contra Primianum ab eiusdem erroris cent  
 tum ferme episcopis ordinatus, et a reliquis trecentis decem  
 episcopis, qui ordinationi eius crima impingebant, fuisse  
 damnatus, docuit populum qui eum sequebatur, etiam extra  
 ecclesiam dari posse baptismum Christi. Denique quicumque  
 aut a Primiano ad Maximianum abiit aut a Maximiano ad  
 Primianum, non est iterum baptizatus ab eo qui contra  
 uoluntatem eorum ordinatus est: comprobantur ab eo quem  
 utique damnauerunt, non abiciunt, non renuunt, non mutant  
 baptismatis sacramentum. Et seu a Primiano siue a Maximiano  
 quis aut baptizetur aut clericus ordinetur, quasi ab uno factus

people acted as if Caecilianus' faults had been truly established; as if the church could lose its status all over the earth because of one man's fault (whether proven or, as it is more likely, unproven); as if Donatus alone could safeguard the health of the church in Africa; and as if the labor of the holy apostles and the passion of martyrs could be nullified in the entire earth. To put it differently, it was as if the very blood of our Savior proved ineffective to preserve the unity of the Catholic faith, which Donatus alone together with a certain number of his sympathizers in Byzantium was able to secure. Thus, they dared to re-baptize Catholics. By doing this they proved to be arrogant and deplorable, since they knew fully well that the universal Church did not approve of desecrating the virtue of baptism, not even in the case of these heretics themselves.

We learn that the main author of this heresy was Donatus, who came to Carthage from Numidia; after stirring a division among the people of Christ against Caecilianus, he gathered around himself a group of bishops and in the name of his faction ordained Majorinus as bishop of Carthage. This Majorinus was succeeded by another Donatus of the same faction, who, thanks to his eloquence strengthened this heresy so much so that many people came to the conclusion that these heretics are called Donatists after him. We still have today Donatus' writings, in which it is proven that on the subject of the Trinity he had spoken against the Catholic faith. Even though he upheld the unity of their substance, nonetheless he attempted to show that the Father is greater than the Son and that the Son is greater than the Holy Spirit. However, none of his followers paid attention to this error since they were focused on other matters. These heretics are called "Montenses" in some parts of Italy; "Parmenians" in the inner regions of Africa; and "Donatists" in the city of Carthage. In both regions of Numidia there are people who are like monks, whom we call "Circumcellions." These men are wild and most reckless servants of demons, who not only rage against others, but who also have no consideration at all for themselves. They are used to kill themselves in various ways, mostly by leaping into precipices, water and fire; they talked as many people of both sexes as they could into pursuing this end. Sometimes they even beg people they come in contact with to kill them, threatening to do the same to them if they refused. Many Donatists, to be honest, disapprove of these people, though only in word and not in deed. In fact, if they truly disapproved of them, they would have nothing to do with them, even though they reproach the church everywhere for the fault of a single man, bishop Caecilianus. As a matter of fact, these Donatists often quarrel among themselves. For instance, at the time of Count Heraclianus, Maximian was ordained bishop of Carthage in opposition to Primian by one hundred bishops who followed his same heresy, but was subsequently condemned by another three hundred ten bishops who decried the impropriety of his ordination.(o) In that circumstance Maximian showed the people who followed him that it is possible to bestow the baptism of Christ even outside the boundaries of the Church. In fact, anyone who abandoned Primian's faction to join Maximian's or vice versa was not rebaptized by the bishop who had [originally] been ordained against their wishes: rather, these men were approved by the bishop who until that time they had found fault with. Also, they did not reject, decline or change the sacrament of baptism. Moreover, a person who was either baptized or ordained to the clergy by Primian or by Maximian received the sacrament almost as if by one person rather than by two persons opposed to each

sit, non a duobus contrariis. In ea dignitate qua ab uno uenerit quis ad alterum, perseverat: non mutatur baptisma nec dignitas tollitur, quia non de baptismatis altercatione, sed de ordinationis contentione facta diuisio comprobatur. De Caeciliani enim ordinatione dissentire coeperunt, non de baptismatis aut fidei transgressione sese ab ecclesia absciderunt.

LXX. Septuagesimam haeresim Priscillianorum apud Hispanos Priscillianus legitur inchoasse. Hi animas diuinae naturae affirmant, quas ad agonem quandam spontaneum in terris exercendum per septem caelos et per quosdam gradatim dicunt descendere principatus, et in malignum principem incurrere a quo istum mundum factum uolunt, atque ab hoc principe per diuersa carnis corpora seminari. Aserunt etiam fatalibus stellis homines colligatos, ipsumque corpus nostrum secundum duodecim signa caeli esse compositum. Prorsus, sicut hi qui mathematici uulgo appellantur, constituunt in capite arietem, taurum in ceruice, geminos in humeris, cancrum in pectore, et cetera nominatim signa percurrentes ad plantas –, a signo Christi ad signa astrologi migrauerunt. Haec et alia fabulosa et uana multa configunt. Vxores a uiris quas potuerint separant. Carnes sicut Manichaei fugiunt. Apocryphas simul cum canoniceis scripturis accipiunt, et in sensu suos allegorizando conuertunt. Trinitatem autem, sicut Sabelliani, ipsum sibi patrem, ipsum sibi filium, ipsum sibi sanctum spiritum confitentur.

LXXI. Septuagesimam et primam haeresim Adelophagi inchoarunt, dicentes non debere ita cibum sumere Christianum ut ab alio uideatur dum comedit. Et haec sola causa eos ab ecclesia separare dignoscitur. Trinitatem enim eiusdem substantiae confitentur. Egerunt cum eis episcopi de Epheso.

LXXII. Septuagesimam et secundam haeresim Rhetorianorum a Rhetorio inchoatam Philastro scribente inuenimus. Hi ad tantam uanitatem deuoluti sunt, ut dicant omnes haereticos recte apud deum incedere. Quia hoc in eorum mentibus datum est, sic colunt deum sicut possunt. Error eorum nobis uidetur reprehensibilis; apud deum autem nec error est nec uituperatio. Hi hoc docentur a suis doctoribus ut, praeter tempa et synagogas, ubicumque inuocatur Christus natus ex uirgine, introeant, et participes se faciant haereticorum.

LXXIII. Septuagesima et tertia haeresis est Theoponitarum. Hi dicunt sic doluisse diuinitatem in Christo dum pateretur, sicut potest dolere anima dum corpus suppliciis agitur, de quibus ait Gregorius episcopus: “infelices et miseri non uident in arboribus, quando ferro caeduntur, solem quidem esse in arboribus. Numquid condolet solis splendor, quem utique, antequam ad lignum perueniat, priorem ictus ferri contingit?” Deus ergo lux est, et quomodo caedi potest lux? Nam quod anima sit quae doleat in corpore, hinc aduertimus quod recedente anima de corpore, nulla

other: in fact, a person was able to retain the same status in which one had joined the other man's faction. Neither baptism nor a person's dignity changed in the least, because it was established that the division among the parties did not issue from a disagreement about baptism, but rather from the controversy over ordination. In fact, Donatists began to disagree with the ordination of Caecilianus, and did not separate themselves from the Church in regard to baptism or to a violation of the faith.

70. It is written that the seventieth heresy of the Priscillianists was started in Spain by Priscillianus. These people claim that souls are of divine nature. They claim that souls descend [from high] by passing through seven heavens and various principalities arranged in [descending] steps in order to participate on earth in a voluntary contest. Once there, they run into the evil prince who they claim created this world and are placed like seeds into various bodies of flesh [and blood]. They claim that people are bound together to stars that determine their fate, and that our own very bodies are arranged according to the twelve signs of the Zodiac. To put it briefly, just like those who are commonly called "Mathematicians," they locate Aries in the head; Taurus in the neck; Gemini in the shoulders; Cancer in the chest. As they follow by name the other signs of the Zodicac, the astrologers end with the soles of the feet, and move from the sign of Christ [i.e., Pisces] to the other signs. (p) They make up these and many other fabulous and vain stories. They cause dissent between those men and women over whom they have influence. They avoid eating meat, like the Manicheans. (q) They read apocryphal texts with the canonical scriptures and interpret them the way they like to, by allegorizing them. They confess the Trinity the way Sabellians do, namely by saying that Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one and the same.

71. The Adelophagi formed the seventy-first heresy by saying that a Christian ought not to partake of food so as to be seen by others in the act of eating. They separate from the Church on this account alone. They believe that the Trinity shares the same substance. Bishops from the city of Ephesus intervened against them.

72. I have learned from Philastrius' writings that the seventy-second heresy of the Rhetoriani was founded by Rhetorius. These people are so deluded as to claim that all kinds of heretics walk close to God on the right path; because this view is stuck in their minds, they worship God as they please. This error of theirs appears reprehensible in my eyes, since with God there is neither error nor blame. These people are taught by their leaders to enter any place, besides churches and synagogues, where the name of Christ born of a virgin is invoked and to partake of the fellowship of heretics.

73. The seventy-third heresy is that of the Theoponites. They say that the divinity in Christ suffered while he suffered, just as the soul is able to suffer when the body experiences pains. Bishop Gregory said about them: "Unhappy and miserable people do not see that when trees are fallen under the axe the sun is in them somehow. Can it be that the sun's splendor suffers [with the tree] when the blow of the ax, before reaching the tree, has an effect on it?" Therefore, since God is light, how can the light possibly be killed? In fact, we are able to realize that it is the soul that suffers in the body, when, upon separating from the latter, the body is unable to feel anything good or bad. Thus, in the body of our Lord Jesus Christ,

potest corpus sentire nec aduersa nec prospera. In corpore ergo domini nostri Iesu Christi anima humanitatis sensit, quam cum corpore assumpsit, non ipse qui assumpsit, sicut nec sol qui in arbore quam memoramus illuxit. Etiam si solis lux in arbore possit a uerberante concidi, in Christo diuinitas non possit a cruciante contingi, quia solis lux creatura est, hic autem creator agnoscitur et probatur. Nam quod anima humanitatis senserit passionem, ipse dominus ait ad discipulos suos dicens: *tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem*. Et hinc dixisse sufficiat. Accedamus ad reliquos.

LXXIV. Septuagesimam et quartam haeresim Triscilidae incurrerunt, qui triformem deum ita asserunt, ut quaedam pars eius sit pater, quaedam filius, quaedam spiritus sanctus, et hinc sit trinitas in unitate. De quibus ait Gregorius: “infelices et miseri non uident quia totam ipsam trinitatem blasphemant. Non est enim deus, nisi qui in se ipso perfectus est. Perfectus ergo pater perfectum ex se genuit filium, perfectus ex patre procedit spiritus sanctus. Ecce tria perfecta non faciunt tres deos, sed unum, quia una est deitas. Non enim sicut sunt tres personae, sic tres deitates, sed sunt tres, pater et filius et spiritus sanctus, sed una deitas, una maiestas, una uirtus, una uoluntas, et una substantia confitenda.”

LXXV. Septuagesimam et quintam haeresim Hydrotheitae fecerunt, aquam deum dicentes, non habentem nec initium nec finem, sordes abluentem, peccata dimittentem et habentem spiritum sanctum. Quos iuste damnat fides catholica quasi caecos et non uidentes aquam quibus spurciis seruit – et potest deus seruire? –, quibus etiam squaloribus, aut cuius momenti est aqua sine consecratione. Illam sermo uiuus uiuificat, sermo sanctus sanctificat, ut sanctus spiritus in ea dignetur habitare aut ut possit credentibus peccata mundare. Et sic, quomodo accipit uim huius rei per benedictionem ut possit omnia mundare peccata, non potest mundare peccata eius qui fidem suam non ex integro prius deo crediderit offerendam. Non ergo per solum abluentem, sed magis per credentem spiritus sanctus infunditur in hominibus, et peccatorum uenia condonatur.

LXXVI. Septuagesimam et sextam haeresim fecerunt Homuncionitae, qui dicunt in corpore hominis esse imaginem dei, non in anima. Vnde Gregorius: “cum imago dei in rebus magnis et primis quae sunt in homine debeat quaeri, in memoria, in intellectu, in scientia, et in illis locis unde homo pietate mouetur, haec statuta in anima sunt, non in corporis liniamentis instructa, et tanto plus similis deo est quanto plus haec, quae memorauimus, purius potuerit obtinere.”

LXXVII. Septuagesimam et septimam haeresim Ametritae instituerunt, dicentes innumerabiles esse mundos. Hoc eos

the soul of his humanity, which he assumed together with his body, was able to feel, and not he himself, just like the sun does not feel anything when it sheds light on a tree. But even if the sun's light can be put off by one who is cutting down a tree, in Christ his divinity cannot be killed by those who crucified him because the sun's light is created, while he himself instead is acknowledged and proven to be the Creator. The fact that it was the soul of his humanity that experienced suffering was declared by the Lord himself when he said to his disciples: *My soul is sorrowful even to death.*<sup>31</sup> Let what he said here be enough. Let us move on to the remaining heresies.

74. The seventy-fourth heresy was incurred by the Triscilidae [or Triformians] who upheld that God is triform in such a way that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are parts of God and form a Trinity when they come together. Gregory said about them: "These wretched and miserable people do not realize they are blaspheming the entire Trinity. In fact, there is no God other than the one who is perfect in and of himself. The perfect Father generated from himself the perfect Son, and the perfect Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. Behold, three perfect realities do not amount to three gods, but to one, because the deity is one. Thus, three persons do not constitute three deities, but the three [persons], Father, Son and Holy Spirit constitute one deity, one majesty, one virtue, one will and one substance to be confessed."

75. The seventy-fifth heresy was developed by the Hydrotheits, claiming that God is water, having no beginning or end, washing filth off, forgiving sins and possessing the Holy Spirit. The Catholic faith rightly condemns them as if they are blind and unable to see that the water which is useful in removing dirt and sins – thus, how can it possibly be useful for God? – or in its flowing is un-consecrated water. The living word vivifies it, the holy word sanctifies it, so that the Holy Spirit may dwell worthily in it or wash away the sins of believers. Thus, just as it receives the power of this thing in order to cleanse all sins, it is unable to cleanse the sins of one who does not believe that he/she first must offer his/her whole faith to God. Therefore, the Holy Spirit is poured into human beings and forgiveness of sins is applied non only through the person who is doing the washing, but more so through the person who believes.

76. The seventy-sixth heresy is that of the Homuncionites, who said that the image of God was impressed in the body, not in the soul. Thus, Gregory replied: "Since the image of God must be sought in the great and first things that are in human beings, namely in memory, mind, knowledge and in those aspects in which a person is moved to act out of love, these things are placed in the soul and not set up in the body's features; the more this image is similar to God, the more these things, which I have just mentioned, can be attained in a purer way."

77. The seventy-seventh heresy was instituted by the Ametrites, who say that there are innumerable worlds. One who is unfamiliar with the philosophers' works

---

<sup>31</sup> Mt 26:38.

dicere nouum putat qui non legit philosophos. Hoc enim olim aliquanti philosophorum dixere gentiles. Nos autem Moysen a deo missum suscipimus, et de mundo quid sentiamus et quid credamus ab ipso didicimus.

LXXVIII. Septuagesimam et octauam haeresim Psychopneumones occuparunt dicentes animas hominum bonas in spiritu angelorum conuerti, animas uero hominum malas in spiritu daemonum mutari. LXXIX. Septuagesimam et nonam haeresim Adecerditae tenent, dicentes: Christo descendenti ad inferos omnis animarum multitudo occurrit, et credidit ei, et liberata est.

LXXX. Octogesima haeresis dicit filium dei postea genitum, postea quam uoluit pater. Si noluisset pater, non genuisset. Esto, confiteamur aequalem filium patri: ut aequalis sit, non est res naturae, sed gratiae. Pater hoc uoluit, ac per hoc totum patris est, non filii. Nos contrario dicimus: sicut fons ex eo genuit flumen ex quo est, ita pater ex eo genuit filium ex quo est, et sicut fons non uolendo et nolendo genuit fluuium, sed gignendo, ita pater non disputando aut uolendo aut nolendo, sed sicut natura fontis haec exstat, ut de plenitudine sua emanet, ita pater de plenitudine sua effundens filium genuit. Et sicut fluuius circuit totum mundum, et mare ingreditur, et tamen de sinu fontis non recedit, ita et filius de sinu patris numquam discessit, nec tunc quando *se humiliauit factus oboediens usque ad mortem*. Sic ergo inter nos per assumptionem apparuit, sed per maiestatem suam de sinu patris numquam discessit. Vt enim hoc ita fieret, nec possibilitas deo defuit, nec uoluntas. Vnum horum si deo defuit, deus non potest nuncupari. Qui enim bonum non uult, malus est, qui non potest quod uult facere, omnipotens non est. Hanc blasphemiam damnantes in haeretico quem diximus, ad ceteros accedamus.

LXXXI. Octogesimam et primam non haeresim accusamus in Lucifero, sed schisma arguimus. Catholicus quidem per omnia, sed Luciferianos faciendo populos et diuidendo se ab ecclesia, a fide sua caritatem exclusit, dicente apostolo: *si fidem habeam ita ut montes transferam, caritatem autem non habeam, nihil mihi prodest*. Gloriantur quidem a fide non deuiasse, sed non paruum crimen arguimus eos incurrere, qui cum dei ecclesia noluerint habere caritatem.

LXXXII. Iouinianistae a Iouiniano quodam octogesimam et secundam haeresim arripuisse detecti sunt. Qui, sicut Stoici philosophi putant, paria dicunt esse uniuersa peccata, nec posse peccare hominem lauacro regenerationis accepto, nec aliquid prodesse ieiuinia uel a cibis aliquibus abstinentiam. Virginitatem sanctae Mariae destruunt dicentes eam pariendo fuisse uiolatam. Virginitatem etiam sanctimonialium et continentium castitatem et in uiris elegantibus caelibem uitam coniugium castorum atque

may be inclined to think that they have actually said something new. As a matter of fact, several pagan philosophers have already said this much. However, we uphold that Moses was sent by God and have learned what we think and believe about the world from him.

78. The Psychopneumones outlined the seventy-eight heresy by saying that the souls of good human beings are converted into angels, but that the souls of bad people are transformed into the spirit of demons.

79. The Adecerdites represent the seventy-ninth heresy, as they say that a great multitude of souls ran to meet Christ's descent into Hades, believed in him and was thereby freed. (r)

80. The eightieth heresy says that the Son of God became Son after the Father's decision. In other words: if the Father had not wanted to generate him, he would not have come into existence. They confess that the Son will become equal to the Father, but the fact that he is equal is not due to his nature but to the Father's grace. The Father wanted this, and in virtue of it everything belongs to the Father and not to the Son. We, however, claim the opposite: just as a spring generates of itself the river that flows out of it, likewise the Father generates the Son, who is from him. Moreover, just like a spring generates a river not by wanting or not-wanting but merely by begetting it, in like manner the Father, not by deliberating whether to do it or not, but in virtue of his being like a spring which brings forth a river and thus emanates water out of its own fullness, generated the Son out of his own fullness. And just like a river flows through the world and [eventually] into the sea and yet does not depart from its very source, likewise the Son never departed from the essence of the Father, not even when *he humbled himself, becoming obedient to death, even death on a cross*.<sup>32</sup> Thus, [the Son] appeared among us by assuming [a human body], though he never departed from the Father's bosom in virtue of his majesty. In order for this to happen, God never lacked either the possibility or the will: if God lacked any of these two things he could not be called "God." One who does not want what is good is evil, and a God who cannot do what he wants to do is not omnipotent. Thus, as we condemn this blasphemy as heretical, let us move on to the rest.

81. In the eighty-first instance we do not accuse Lucifer [bishop of Cagliari] of heresy but blame him for a schism. Being a Catholic in all things, but by creating a group of followers who take after his name that separated itself from the Church, he left love out of his faith, as the apostle [Paul] said: *If I have all faith so as to move mountains but do not have love, I am nothing.*<sup>33</sup> As these people took pride in not having deviated from the faith, we blame them for incurring the not indifferent sin of refusing to share in the love of the Church.

82. The Jovianists, who take their name from Jovinianus, have been found articulating the eighty-second heresy. These people, like Stoic philosophers believe, claim that all sins have the same weight and that once a person has received the baptismal regeneration he/she cannot sin, and that fasting or abstaining from some

---

<sup>32</sup> Phil 2:8.

<sup>33</sup> 1 Cor 13:2.

fidelium meritis adaequant, ita ut quaedam uirgines sacrae prouectae etiam aetatis, eo auditu nupsisse dicantur. Non sane ipse Iouinianus uel habebat uel habere uolebat uxorem. Quod factum non futurae uitiae profuturum dicebat, sed praesenti commodo applicabat. Contra hunc suscepit sanctus Ambrosius Mediolanensis episcopus, quiue edidit librum ad destruenda omnia commenta adiuuentionum eius. Quod lectum in media Romana, id est ecclesia Lateranensi, una uoce et populus Romanus et sacerdotes in eisdem Iouinianistis et ipso Iouiniano anathema clamauerunt in ipso initio quadragesimae sancto Anastasio episcopo antistite. Denique in ipsa authentica hebdomada Paschae inuenti sunt epulantes et porcorum carnibus trahentes conuiuia, ita ut assum porcum quem in mensa eorum inuenerant populi collo eius suspenderent, et ita eum totam ciuitatem facerent circuire. Scripsit etiam contra hos Hieronymus presbyter certos libros, quos qui plenius legerit, et quanta bona uirginitas et continentia et abstinentia habeat discit, et quanta mala edacitas et luxuria habeat perhorrescit.

LXXXIII. Octogesimam et tertiam haeresim in sexto libro historiographus noster ponit Eusebius, quam nec Epiphanius alicubi memorauit nec Polycrates nec Africanus nec Hesiodus, qui Graeco sermone uniuersas haereses describentes uolumina multorum condidere librorum. In sexto itaque, ut dixi, libro narrat Eusebius esse in Arabia haereticos, quorum quia auctorem non memorat, nos possumus eos nuncupare Arabicos. Hi, inquit, dicunt animas cum corporibus mori atque dissolui, et in fine saeculi utrumque reparari. Sed hos, inquit, disputatione Origenis magna memorat ex parte reuocatos.

LXXXIV. Octogesimam et quartam haeresim Heluidianos occupasse ab Heluidio memoramus, qui ita uirginitati sanctae Mariae contradicunt ut eam dicant de Ioseph post natuitatem Christi alias filios peperisse: isti quidem nuper, id est sub Siricio Romanorum antistite orti sunt, et per Italiam atque Gallias direxerunt suos discipulos. Contra hos scripsit Hieronymus dictor egregius duos libros, quos lectos in tempore digna eos exsecratione anathematizabant. Epiphanius autem noster, scrutator haereticorum, scribens contra hos libellum qui in illo tempore hanc blasphemias plenam assertionem proferebant, [qua de causa] <Antidico> maritas eos censuit appellari.

LXXXV. Octogesimam et quintam haeresim Paterniani inchoasse leguntur. Hi inferiores humani corporis partes non a deo, sed a diabolo factas opinantur: et omnium ex illis partibus licentiam tribuentes impurissime uiuunt. Hos dum Damasus damnaret episcopus detectos in scelere huiusmodi, de his in relatione sua ad Valentianum maiorem scripsit dicens: “scire uolumus pietatem uestram Venustianos in scelere turpissimo detectos ab apostolica

types of food is useless. They reject the [perpetual] virginity of Mary by saying that she lost it in childbirth. They also put the virginity of consecrated nuns on the same level of merits acquired by the faithful with that chastity that is practiced in marriage, and the celibate life of monastics with the life of spouses who abstain from sex. After hearing that view, some consecrated nuns, even a few advanced in age, are said to have gotten married. Jovinianus himself, however, did not have nor wished to have a wife. Having made this choice, he said he didn't privilege it in view of some future benefit in the next life, but because this choice suited him better in this present life. Saint Ambrose, bishop of Milan, criticized him and even wrote a book to refute all his views. (s) After this work was read in the middle of the church of Rome, namely in the Lateran church, the Roman people and clergy univocally invoked an anathema against Jovinian and his followers at the very beginning of Lent, when St Anastasius I was Pope. Worse yet, these people were caught eating and having banquets with pork meat during the very week of Easter; it was found that they held roasted pork by its neck on their tables and that they shared it with the entire city. St Jerome wrote some books against him; if anyone was to read them in their entirety, they will find that Jerome taught the great value of virginity, sexual continence and abstinence, and that he recoiled at the great evils of gluttony and self-indulgence.

83. Our historiographer Eusebius described the eighty-third heresy in his sixth book. (t) This heresy was not mentioned either by Polycrates, or by Africanus, or by Hesiod, who described in the Greek language all the heresies in several volumes. As I said, in his sixth book, Eusebius relates that there are heretics in Arabia, whose founder he does not recall, though we may call them "Arabians." These people claim that souls die and are dissolved at the time of death, though at the end of time they will be revived. Eusebius also said that these people were brought back to the fold following a great dispute Origen had with them.

84. We recall that the Elvidians, founded by Elvidius, produced the eighty-fourth heresy. They denied the virginity of holy Mary by saying that after Jesus's birth she bore other children from Joseph. The Elvidians arose not too long ago, at the time of Pope Siricius, and claimed to be followers of Elvidius in Italy and in Gaul. I am told that Jerome, an exceptional writer, authored two books against them, in which he anathematized them with a well-deserved condemnation. Our Epiphanius, who investigated all sorts of heretics, when writing a short treatise against those who fully articulated this belief marred by various blasphemies, resolved to call them "Antidicomarites."

85. The Paternians are reputed to have started the eighty-fifth heresy. These people believe that the lower parts of the human body have been made not by God, but by the devil. By allowing all sorts of turpitudes stemming from such organs, they live in a most impure way. Pope Damasus, after finding out that they lived in such way, condemned them. He wrote about them in his report to Emperor Valentinian, saying: "We want Your Grace to know that after discovering Venustians living in a most immoral way, the Apostolic See firmly condemned them." However, at the

sede esse damnatos.” Quorum etiam confessiones simul direxit. Contra hos postea lex specialis egressa est ut, ubicumque essent reperti, uindice gladio agerentur.

LXXXVI. Tertullianistas olim a Sotere papa Romano damnatos legimus. Cur autem octogesimam et sextam eos haeresim dicamus arripiisse, haec causa est, quod quaedam Octauiana ueniens ex Africa, cuius uir, Hesperius nomine, uidebatur duci Arbogasti ualde coniunctus, qui etiam apud Maximum tyrrannum multum potuit, haec Octauiana adduxit secum quendam tergiuersatorem uersutumque daemonem, cui uix centum occurrerent uerbosanti atque in hominem confidenti. Hic cum se presbyterum diceret Tertullianistam, meruit per sacrum scriptum ut sibi collegium extra muros urbis fabricaret. Quod dum impetrasset a tyrranno Maximo, sanctorum nostrorum exclusit locum, id est duorum fratrum Processi et Martiniani, dicens eos Phryges fuisse, et ideo hanc legem tenuisse quam Tertullianus, atque hoc ordine per occasionem martyrum dei populum seducebat. Deo autem Theodosio religioso Augusto dante uictoriam, punitoque satellite Maximi de cuius se Tertullianista potestate iactabat, statim fugit cum matrona qua uenerat, nec uiuentis nec mortui rumore renouato. Martyrum suorum deus excubias catholicae festiuitati restituit. Tertullianus autem fuit ciuis et presbyter Carthaginiensis. Opuscula eloquentissima et feruentia in defensione edidit ueritatis. Hic apud Carthaginem basilicam habuit, ubi populi ad eum conueniebant. Quae basilica usque ad Aurelium episcopum fuit. Agente enim Augustino Hipponeensi episcopo et rationabiliter cum eis disputante conuersi sunt, ecclesiamque suam sanctae ecclesiae contulerunt. Tertullianum autem catholica hinc reprehendit auctoritas, quod animam ex anima nasci dicit, et defendit Montanum et Priscam et Maximillam contra fidem catholicam et contra Apollonium episcopum orientis et contra Soterem papam urbis Romae, ut supra diximus, dum Cataphryges haereticos detegeremus, a quibus postea diuisus. Ne plebs Montani nomen Tertulliani uideretur excludere, fudit a se omnem Phrygiae uanitatem et Tertullianistarum conuenticula propagauit, nihil tamen in fide mutauit. Nam et secundas nuptias condemnat, ut diximus, animam ex traduce uenire asserit, et nos catholicos psychicos titulat. Vbicunque autem legeris Tertulliani aduersum psychicos, scias eum contra catholicos agere.

LXXXVII. In octogesima et septima haeresi Abelotitas nominamus quia, cum sint priores paene omnibus haereticis, nunc nostris temporibus finiti. Isti ex filio Adae sibi nominis deriuationem assumpserant, id est ab Abel Abelotae se nominari uoluerunt. Hi non miscebantur uxoribus, et tamen non licebat sectae ipsi ut sine uxoribus uiuerent. Mas ergo et femina, sub continentiae professione simul habitantes, puerum et puellam sibi adoptabant in

same time, he accepted the repentance of some of them. Afterwards, a special law was passed against them, stating that wherever they happened to be found they were to be put to death by the sword.

86. We read that Tertullianists were once condemned by Pope Soter. The reason why we say that they founded the eighty-sixth heresy is as follows. A certain woman named Octaviana, hailing from Africa, whose husband was named Hesperius (who apparently was very closely connected to the military commander Arbogast, who acted powerfully against the tyrant Maximus), brought with her [to Rome] a cunning and shifty devil, who attracted a following of barely one hundred people who trusted him and his verbosity. This man, claiming he was a Tertullianist priest, earned through a sacred document the right to establish a congregation for himself outside the walls of Rome. While begging the tyrant Maximus to be granted this privilege, he obtained the right to exclude [Catholics] from this place dedicated to our saints, namely the two martyrs and our brothers Processus and Martinian, [falsely] claiming that they were Phrygians and that they upheld the same doctrine that Tertullian himself upheld; thus, [thanks to] this concession [from Maximus] he deceived the people of God in regard to the two martyrs. However, after God gave victory to the pious emperor Theodosius, and Maximus' adjutant was punished, about whose power the Tertullianist priest boasted, this man suddenly fled with the woman who held him in high esteem and the two were never heard of again. Then God arranged for the restoration of the Catholic festivity of his two martyrs. Tertullian himself was a priest and a citizen of Carthage. He published very eloquent and passionate short writings in defense of the truth. He served in a basilica near Carthage, where people flocked to hear him; that basilica eventually became bishop Aurelius' own. (u) As Augustine, bishop of Hippo, pleaded with them and engaged them with rational arguments, they came back to the fold and returned that basilica to the Catholic Church. Catholic authorities eventually reproached Tertullian for saying that souls are begotten from other souls (v) and for defending Montanus, Prisca and Maximilla in their quarrel against the Catholic faith and against the eastern bishop Apollonius and Pope Soter, though he eventually parted company from the Cataphryges heretics whom we previously discussed. So that it wouldn't look that the followers of Montanus had excluded him as one of their own, Tertullian forsook any pride about Phrygia and fostered small groups of followers, though he never changed anything about the faith. Tertullian condemned second marriage, as I recalled; claimed that the soul is transmitted from the parents' souls; and called us Catholic "carnal." Wherever you read that Tertullian inveighed against "carnal people" you should know that he was referring to Catholics.

87. We call the Abelites representatives of the eighty-seventh heresy; though they preceded in time virtually all heretics, they have become extinct in our day and age. These people chose for themselves the name of Adam's son: in other words, they wanted to be named "Abelites" after Abel. They did not have relations with their wives, and yet their sect did not allow them to live in an unmarried state. Therefore, both males and females living together under the vow of chastity used to adopt a boy and a girl who would become their successors and future followers of the same marital

eiusdem coniunctionis pacto successores futuros. Morte praeuentis quibusque singulis alii subrogabantur, dum tamen duo duobus disparis sexus in illius domus societate succederent. Et utrolibet quippe parente defuncto uni remanenti usque ad eius quoque obitum filii seruiebant, post cuius mortem etiam ipsi puerum et puellam similiter adoptabant. Nec umquam eis defuit unde adoptarent, generantibus circumquaque uicinis, et filios suos inopes ad spem hereditatis alienae libenter dantibus. Haec sola erat inter nos atque illos distantia, in quo nostros arguebant ita non in lege nostra exercere coniugia ut et qui nubunt tamquam non nubentes sint.

LXXXVIII. Octogesimam et octauam haeresim in Pelagio se inuenisse sedes apostolica sub papa sancto Innocentio docuit, dum Caelestius Pelagii discipulus apud Carthaginem doceret posse homines sine peccato esse natura sibi sufficiente sola humana. Restitit ei quidam Paulinus diaconus, defensor et procurator ecclesiae Mediolanensis, cuique in conuentu sacerdotum multa capitula obiecit contra fidem catholicam, quae Caelestius damnare neglexit dicens: “non ad me pertinet de his quae obicitis, ubi meum nomen est et crimen alienum.” Tunc illi obtulerunt ei libros suos, ubi dicebat ipsam sibi hominis naturam ad perfectionem posse sufficere, hoc est tantum potest homo exercere iustitiam, ut etiam sine peccato possit esse, si uelit. “Adam mortalem factum, qui siue peccaret siue non peccaret, esset moriturus. Sic lex misit ad regnum, sicut euangelia. Infantes in remissionem peccatorum baptizandos esse ideo confitemur propter regulam uniuersalis ecclesiae. Nihil obfuisse generi humano peccatum Adae.” Omnia haec oppositionum genera ad damnandum obiciebantur Caelestio. Sed ille dicebat multa esse in his quae teneret fides eius, et propter ipsa cetera damnare non posse. Tunc ad relationem paene omnium Afrorum episcoporum papa Innocentius damnationem et Pelagio et Caelestio conscripsit. Illi autem, siue antequam damnarentur ab uniuersali ecclesia siue posteaquam damnati sunt, non cessauerunt scribere posse hominem sine peccato esse, et nihil obfuisse Adam generi humano, et legem sic misisse ad regnum sicut euangelia, et infantes non ideo baptizandos quia habere possint originale peccatum, et naturam tam bene factam a deo, ut sibi sola sufficiat ad hoc ut possit carere peccato. Contra hos suscepit sine scriptura quidam Constantius tractator. Post hunc autem scripsit contra hos et Augustinus Hippensis episcopus et Hieronymus presbyter Bethleites. Pelagiani tamen seu Caelestiani catholicae plebi permixti sunt, quia ecclesiam aliam non habent, et ideo ubi eis euenerit, communionem non renuunt. Dicunt enim unius confessionis se esse in hac parte, in qua eucharistia conficitur. “De quaestione enim, aiunt,

practice. When individual members died, others replaced them making sure however that the two deceased individuals of different gender were replaced with another pair of individuals. When one of the two parents died, the adopted children would serve the surviving spouse up to his/her death. When that happened, the children themselves would adopt another boy and girl themselves. These people never lacked the opportunity to adopt since their poor neighbors gave birth to children and gladly gave them away, motivated by the hope that one day they would inherit the adoptive parents' goods. This was the only difference between us and them, as they argued against us that marriage was not supposed to be kept according to our custom, and that those who marry should live as if they weren't married.

88. The Apostolic See under Pope Innocent I taught that the eighty-eight heresy was found in Pelagius's teachings, as Caelestius, Pelagius' disciple, professed in the town of Carthage that human beings can live without sin since human nature alone was sufficient for that purpose. He was opposed by a certain deacon Paulinus, defender and notary of the church of Milan. In a gathering of priests, Paulinus objected to Caelestius several points the latter raised against the Catholic faith, which he failed to condemn by saying: "The things you object to do not apply to me: though my name is associated with them, I am innocent of any crime." Then, they brought to him his own books, in which he claimed that human nature was enough unto itself to attain perfection, namely that a human being can practice justice to the point of being sinless, if indeed he/she wants to: "Adam was created in a mortal state, so that whether he would have sinned or not, he would have died anyway. Thus, both the Law and the Gospels pointed the way to God's kingdom. Thus, we confess that infants must be baptized according to the rule of the universal Church, though Adam's sin did not harm humankind in any way." All these kinds of statements contrary to the faith were objected to Caelestius in order for him to condemn them. However, he said that there were many points in these statements which he firmly subscribed to and that consequently he could not bring himself to condemn them. Thus, following this report, Pope Innocent I persuaded almost all the African bishops to subscribe to the condemnation of both Pelagius and Caelestius. Nonetheless, both men both before and after the condemnation by the entire Church did not desist in their writings to claim that a person can be sinless; that Adam's sin did not affect his progeny; that the Law was able to lead people to the kingdom of God, just like the Gospels; that infants did not need to be baptized because they did not have original sin; and finally, that human nature was created so well by God that it was powerful enough to remain free of sin. Against them rose a certain homilist named Constantius, though not in writing. After him, Augustine, bishop of Hippo and Jerome, a priest who lived in Bethlehem, wrote against them. However, Pelagians, or Caelestians, intermingled with the Catholic flock since they did not create their own church and therefore, as far as it was up to them, they did not break fellowship [with the Church]. In fact, they say that they share with us the same faith as far as the Eucharist is concerned. They say: "We differ from you in regard to [theological] issues, but not about fellowship." As far as this view is concerned, if they are reproached by our people they become open to criticism from and are held in disesteem by their own followers, since they have their own clergy and bishops. Pelagius himself wrote this much in his commentary

non de communione discernimur.” Pro hoc ausu, et a nostris si deprehendantur, periculis subiacent, et a suis execrationi habentur. Habent enim et presbyteros et episcopos suos. Ipse autem Pelagius ita in commentario suo ad Romanos scribit, dum ageret illum locum quo ait apostolus quoniam *per unum in hoc mundo peccatum intravit, et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes homines pertransiit, in quo omnes peccauerunt*, tangens Caelestium, qui contra traducem peccati primus scripsit, his uerbis ait: “hi, inquit, qui contra traducem uenient, ita illam impugnare nituntur: si Adae peccatum etiam non peccantibus obfuit, ergo et Christi gratia etiam non credentibus prodest. Addunt etiam hoc: si baptisma tollit originale illud peccatum, de duobus baptizatis nati debent hoc carere peccato. Quomodo enim mittunt ad posteros quod ipsi in se minime habuerunt?” Haec, sicut ab ipso Pelagio sunt scripta, posuimus. De hoc itaque quod dictum est, posse hominem sine peccato esse, obiectum est illis ita: “aut potest, et adiutorium non quaerit, aut non potest, et adiutorium quaerit.” A quocumque enim auxilium quaeritur, dicit se id quod uult facere implere non posse, alioquin irrisorie poscit qui potest hoc solus pro quo adiutorium postulat adimplere. Verbi gratia, decem pondo cuiuscumque rei si leuare uoluerim, et adiutorium quaeram, ridiculum uideor exhibere dum posco. At uero si ducentas aut amplius uelim leuare libras, quia id implere non possum, auxilium flagito, et immensis precibus adiutorium quaero, praecipue si status uitae meae in hoc uidetur pondere positus, ut si pondus quod memoraui non leuauero, ad uitam peruenire non possim. De duobus autem baptizatis natum nihil habere de fide parentum haec nos ratio docet, quoniam hi qui baptizati sunt, duas habent natuitates, unam qua eos generauit caro, aliam qua eos regenerauit spiritus sanctus, et ex his duabus generationibus nati duas generationes ad posteros mittunt, unam de carne coniugii ministerio, aliam de spiritu baptimate consecrando. Hic ergo qui de baptizatis natus est, interrogo de qua re natus est, de carne, id est de prima generatione, an de spiritu, id est de secunda regeneratione? Si de spiritu natus est, baptizari non debet. Quare? Quia spiritus sanctus eum fecit nasci, non libido coniugii. Sin autem de coniugio carnali, id est masculo et femina, restat ut unde sunt regenerati de Christo et ecclesia, suam iterum regenerent prolem. De primo enim est Adam quod nascimur, de secundo autem Adam quod iterum recreamur dicente sancto apostolo: *factus est primus homo Adam in animam uiuentem, nouissimus Adam in spiritu uiuificantem. Sed non prius quod spiritale est, sed quod animale est. Deinde quod spiritale est. Primus homo de terra terrenus, secundus homo de caelo caelestis. Ergo, sicut portauimus*

to the Letter to the Romans, as he exegeted that passage in which the apostle Paul said: *Just as through one person sin entered the world, and through sin, death, and thus death came to all, inasmuch as all sinned*,<sup>34</sup> (w) which rebuffs Caelestius, who was the first to write against the idea that original sin was transmitted through generation. Pelagius himself wrote: “Those who attack the idea of transmission of original sin strive to reject this passage in this manner: if Adam’s sin did not affect those who sin, it follows that Christ’s grace does not help believers either. Moreover, these people say: if baptism removes original sin, those born out of baptized parents must be lacking this sin. For how could they transmit to their progeny what they themselves no longer have in themselves?” We quote these things as they have been written down by Pelagius himself. Now, in regard to what has been said, namely that a human being can live without sin, it was objected to them: “Either a person can, and thus he/she does not seek for help, or he/she can’t, and thus he/she seeks for help.” In fact, anyone who seeks for help thereby admits that they cannot do what they want, otherwise if they could do it by themselves, this would constitute a pointless request on their part. For example, if I wanted to lift any object that weighs ten pounds and asked for help, I would look ridiculous if I tried to do it by myself while simultaneously asking for help. But if I wanted to lift two hundred pounds or more, which is something I cannot do on my own, and begged for help, and asked for it through countless prayers (especially in the case in which my life appears to be placed under such a burden), unless I succeeded in lifting such an unbearable burden, I could not attain eternal life. Common sense teaches us that a person born of two baptized parents does not inherit anything from their faith because these people who have been baptized have two births, so to speak: one, in which they were generated by the flesh, and the other in which they were generated by the Holy Spirit. Thus, those who are born from these two generative processes transmit two generations to their progeny: one from the intercourse of the parents, and the other from the consecration of the Spirit in baptism. So, let me ask a person born from baptized parents: from what source were you born? From the flesh, namely from the first generative process, or from the Spirit, namely from the second one? If you were born from the second, you must not be baptized. Why? Because the Holy Spirit caused your birth, and not the lust of your parents. If on the contrary you were born from your parents’ intercourse, namely from a man and a woman, the fact remains that, having been regenerated from Christ and his church, [your parents] in turn generated their progeny again. We owe it to the first Adam that we are born into this world, but we are recreated by the second Adam as the holy apostle [Paul] wrote: *The first man, Adam, became a living being,’ the last Adam a life-giving spirit. But the spiritual was not first; rather the natural and then the spiritual. The first man was from the earth, earthly; the second man, from heaven. As was the earthly one, so also are the earthly, and as is the heavenly one, so also are the heavenly. Just as we have borne the image of the earthly one, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly one.*<sup>35</sup> “Just as we have borne the image of the earthly

<sup>34</sup> Rom 5:12.

<sup>35</sup> 1 Cor 15:45–49.

*imaginem terreni, id est sicut creaui mus filios carnaliter, portemus et imaginem caelestis, id est quos creaui mus carnaliter, spiritualiter recreemus, aut ipsi qui carnaliter creati sumus nutu creatoris, iterum eius gratia spiritualiter recreemur. Hoc autem dico, dixit apostolus, quia caro et sanguis, id est prima tantum generatione homines nati, nisi gratiam diuinam meruerint adipisci, regnum dei inuenire non possunt, neque corruptio incorruptionem possidebit.* LXXXIX. Octogesimam et nonam haeresim Nestorius Constantinopolites episcopus legitur incurrisse. Consuetudo est namque ut unum tractatum suum episcopus Alexandrinus mittat ad Constantinopolim, qui recitetur in Pascha, et tractatum suum Constantinopolites, qui Alexandriae recitetur. In tractatu suo Constantinopolites Nestorius scripsit Mariam non esse θεοτόκον, sed Χριστοτόκον, id est non deum peperisse, sed hominem. Cyrilus Alexandrinus hoc dictum ita reprehendit, quo diceret per epistolam, ut si eum forte fefellisset, emendaret dictum. Ex hoc ipso quo reprehensus est Nestorius a Cyrillo, coepit Cyrillum haereticum in clamare. Data est synodus apud Thessalonicanam, et nec sic emendare uoluit Nestorius ut diceret Mariam deum et hominem genuisse, “sed solum, inquit, hominem.” Si enim dixerimus quia deum genuit, fecimus matrem deum, sicut gentiles. Maria ergo, inquit, templum deo genuit, non ipsum qui in templo habitat. Accepit indutias ut aut damnaret dictum, et rediret ad sedem suam episcopus, aut, si damnare noluisse, postea redire non posset. Noluit, et in eadem confessione permansit. Hunc synodus apud Thessalonicanam damnauit, in qua damnatione Romanus papa Caelestinus scripsit, et omnes cum eo pariter orientales atque occidentales episcopi subscriberunt. XC. Nonagesima haeresis, quam in praefatione nostra diximus de nomine Augustini episcopi esse mentitam, Praedestinatorum nomen accepit. Hi electionem bonorum et recusationem malorum deo decernente definiunt, non homine uel studente uel negligente. Nolunt dei iura uel ab studentibus custodiri uel a negligentibus uiolari. Dicunt: “etiam si uoluerit bonum facere qui ad malum praedestinatus est a deo, ad bonum peruenire non poterit. Nam qui ad bonum praedestinatus est, etiam si negligat, ad bonum perducetur inuitus.” Dicunt baptismatis undam non uniuersa peccata mundare. Dicunt: “ita antecedit gratia liberum arbitrium ut ante accipiat homo quam petat, ante inueniat quam quaerat, ante ei aperiatur quam pulset.” Dicunt nullum ad Christi fidem accedere, nisi fuerit a patre tractus inuitus, illud attendentes: *nemo uenit ad me, nisi quem pater attraxerit.* Dicunt omnia non in re, sed ita in spe fieri, ut quod dicit apostolus: *spes quae uidetur, non est spes*, etiam hoc mysteriis applicent dictum et dicant: “ea quae percipiuntur, uidentur quidem esse, sed non sunt.” Dicunt: “plus obfuit ad nocendum

one,” meaning, as we generate our children in a carnal way “we shall also bear the image of the heavenly one,” meaning we also regenerate in a spiritual way those we created in a carnal way; or, to put it differently, we who are created in a carnal way by the will of our Creator are regenerated again in a spiritual way by his grace. The apostle said: *This I declare, brothers: flesh and blood* – meaning people born of the first type of generation, unless they deserved to attain divine grace – *cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does corruption inherit incorruption.*<sup>36</sup>

89. We read that Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, incurred the eighty-ninth heresy. There was a common practice that on Easter day the bishop of Alexandria would send a writing of his to be read in Constantinople, and that the bishop of Constantinople would send one of his writings to be read in Alexandria. In his treatise, Nestorius wrote that Mary is not θεοτοκον but χριστοτοκον in other words, that she did not give birth to God, but to a man. The Alexandrian bishop Cyril condemned this expression and said in his letter that if by chance Nestorius made a mistake, he should amend it. But Nestorius, having been reproached on this account by Cyril, began to call the latter a heretic. A synod was held near Thessalonica, but Nestorius even refused to say that Mary begat both God and a man, but, in his own words, “only a man.” He claimed that if Mary begat God, we would have to make her the mother of God, the way pagans used to believe. Thus, he said, Mary begat a temple for God, not the One who dwells in the temple himself. Nestorius was given a period of time to recant and condemn his view and thus return to his see as a bishop, or, if he refused to condemn his view, he would not be able to return at all. However, he refused [to recant] and held on to his view. The synod near Thessalonica condemned him, joined in this by Pope Celestine, with the support of all Eastern and Western bishops.

90. The ninetieth heresy, which in my Preface I said was falsely attributed to bishop Augustine, took the name of Predestinationists. These people claim that the election of good people and the rejection of evil ones is up to God’s decision and not human beings, whether they are diligent or negligent. They deny that God’s laws are observed by those who attend to them and violated by those who ignore them. They are used to say: “Anyone who has been predestined by God unto evil, even if they wanted to do what is good, they will not be able to reach it. On the other hand, anyone who has been predestined to good, even if they become negligent, they will be led to the good against their own will.” They claim that the water of baptism does not wash away all sins. They say: “God’s grace precedes free will in such a way that a person who requests it, receives it beforehand; a person who seeks it, finds it beforehand; and to a person who knocks, the door will be opened beforehand.” They say that no one can come to faith in Christ unless they were drawn against their own will by the Father, as they quote that scriptural verse: *No one can come to me unless the Father*

---

<sup>36</sup> 1 Cor 15:50.

Adam generi humano, quam Christus in subueniendo.” “Nam Adam, aiunt, quod nocuit ita manet ut hoc nec passio Christi nec baptismatis sanctificatio possit auferre.” Verum quid moras tibi, o lector sancte et studiose, incutimus? Librum eorum tibi integrum, sicut est editus, in isto corpore praesentamus, cuius lectione cognosces definitiones eius a metatoribus antichristi adiuentes. Quotiescumque autem contra eos suscepimus, dixerunt nos ex haereticorum argutiis contra se agere. Videntes enim se ita superari, ut suspirare non possent, hanc calumniam semper catholicis nisibus irrogarunt, ut dum timent se haereticos infamari, in silentio ueritatis loquela artarent. Eorum ergo ob causam omnes haereses a Simone memorantes huc usque deteximus, ut probemus nos soli fidei catholicae esse concordes. Rogamus te, domine, pater caeli et terrae, qui cum filio tuo et spiritu sancto unius ueritatis obtines maiestatem, unius maiestatis obtines deitatem, unius deitatis obtines trinitatem ut nos adiuues contra hostes tuos delatrantes. Habeant illi castra Goliae in allophylorum acie constituta. Nos Hebraei, pueri tui Dauid pastoforium assumentes de lapide tuo angulari, pugnemus ut fidenter cum apostolo tuo dicere ualeamus: *deo nostro gratias, qui dedit nobis uictoriam per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum.* Sit pax omnibus catholicis, et cum angelis una nobis cum uoce exclament decantantes: *gloria in excelsis deo, et in terra pax hominibus bona voluntatis.*

*who sent me draw him.*<sup>37</sup> They claim that all things are attained not in reality but in hope, so that they apply this saying of the apostle Paul: *Now hope that sees for itself is not hope*<sup>38</sup> even to the sacred mysteries, and thus say: “Those things that are seen, appear to be something, but they are not really so.” They argue: “Adam was more harmful to humankind than Christ was beneficial to it by coming to its aid. In fact, [the consequences of] what was harmful to humankind [i.e., original sin] remain in us, so that neither Christ’s Passion nor the sanctification brought by baptism is able to remove it.”

My holy and diligent reader, what challenge have we set before you? We are going to present to your attention this entire book of theirs, just as it appears in writing, as part of our investigation; in the process of reading it you will know that the beliefs it contains have been devised by the followers of the Antichrist. However, every time we criticized them, they said that we are doing so by resorting to the sophistry typical of heretics. As they realize that they have been defeated to the point of being rendered speechless, they put heavy pressure on Catholics by resorting to this lie, so that, as we fear to be labeled as heretics, they may silence the proclamation of the truth. It is because of them that we have recalled all heresies from the time of Simon Magus until now, so that we may establish that we are in full agreement only with the Catholic faith.

We now beseech you Lord, Father of heaven and earth, who with your Son and Holy Spirit retain the majesty of the only truth, the deity of the only one majesty, and the Trinity of the only one deity, to come to our aid in the struggle against your barking enemies. Let them be like the encampment of Goliath arraigned against us in orderly formation; we, on the other hand, who are like the Jews, and the children of your shepherd son David standing on the cornerstone of your holy temple, will fight so that we may be worthy of confidently saying with your apostle: *But thanks be to God who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.*<sup>39</sup> May peace be with all Catholics as they proclaim in one voice together with us and the angels: *Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace to those on whom his favor rests.*<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Jn 6:44.

<sup>38</sup> Rom 8:24.

<sup>39</sup> 1 Cor 15:57.

<sup>40</sup> Lk 2:14.

## LIBER SECUNDUS

Incipit liber nonagesimae haeresis qui asserit dei praedestinatione peccata committi.

1. Participem me intentionis uestrae, qui defenditis ueritatem, fieri fratrum spiritualium suggestio inuitauit. Vnde breuiter nisibus uestris me intersetens, sermonis latitudinem fugi, sensusque qui latum quaerunt certaminis campum in angustum constitui, ut et fastidium nobis lectionis auferrem, et occasionem defendandae ueritatis afferrem atque dimicantes seruos contra uoluntatem sui domini confutarem, eorum qui dicunt deo inuito et nolente hominum moueri arbitria, ac de potestate mortalium dei immortalis potestatem infringi. Huc adiciunt homines per uoluntatem suam sanctos fieri, et suo arbitratu ad dei amicitias peruenire. Leui hos impulsione uidebitis corruentes, a quibus sollicitudo humana et meliores et primas accipit partes, quibus excluso deo dicitur homo non ordinatione dei, sed sua se posse uoluntate seruare. Vos autem, o filii caritatis, zelum fidei signatum in uestris sensibus retinentes estote securi de ordinatione dei, quam praedestinando constituit, certaque sit nostris sensibus apostolico ore dicta sententia, quoniā *cui uult deus miseretur, et quem uult indurat. Non est enim uolentis neque currentis, sed miserentis est dei, quia habet potestatem figulus luti ex eadem massa facere unum uas ad honorem, aliud ad contumeliam.* Et inde est quod caro aduersatur spiritui, spiritus carni: *haec, inquit apostolus, inuicem sibi aduersantur, ut non quae uultis, illa faciatis.* In opere enim suo deus omnes homines ante praeuidit, et quid unicuique competeteret praeuidendo constituit. Hoc maiestatis eius singulare indicium, in quo parem non habet.
2. Deus solus est enim qui cogitanda, loquenda, operanda praesciit, et quia praesciit cunctorum generaliter gesta antequam fierent, merita dispungendo quasi facta conspexit. Et idcirco res, quasi oculatas et sibi in manifesto positas, tunc quando

## SECOND BOOK

*Here begins the book of the ninetieth heresy, which claims that sins are committed because of God's predestination.*

1. A suggestion of our spiritual brothers has led me to become involved in your attempt to defend the truth. Thus, as I briefly join your efforts, I avoided engaging in a long discussion and narrowed the field of disagreement and interpretation which our opponents instead prefer to widen. I did this in order to spare us all the trouble of a long lecture; to seize the opportunity to defend the truth; and to refute those servants who oppose their Lord's will. I am referring to those who say that human beings' wills can be directed against God's wishes and will, and that the power of the immortal God is thwarted by the power of mortal beings. Moreover, these people claim that human beings can become holy through their own will and that they can attain God's friendship by their own choice. Watch them being led astray by a fickle argument, as they attribute to human solicitude the best and first place. They say that, without God's help, people are able to save themselves through their own will rather than because of God's previous arrangement. But you, children of God's love, retaining the zeal of faith sealed in your senses, be confident about God's providential arrangement which he has established by means of predestination. Let us be certain in our minds about the words spoken by the Apostle: *So it depends not upon a person's will or exertion, but upon God, who shows mercy... Consequently, he has mercy upon whom he wills, and he hardens whom he wills.*<sup>1</sup> Because, *does not the potter have a right over the clay, to make out of the same lump one vessel for a noble purpose and another for an ignoble one?*<sup>2</sup> This is why the flesh is opposed to the spirit, and the spirit to the flesh. The Apostle said: *these are opposed to each other, so that you may not do what you want.*<sup>3</sup> In his work, God foresaw all people and established what befits each and every person simply by foreseeing it. This is a special sign of his majesty, in which he has no equals.

2. Only God foreknew the things that are to be thought, spoken and done. Since he foreknew in an all-embracing way everybody's deeds, even before they actually took place, when he looked again at his creation he regarded the meritorious deeds [that human beings one day would perform] as if they had already taken place For this reason,

---

<sup>1</sup> Rom 9:16,18.

<sup>2</sup> Rom 9:21.

<sup>3</sup> Gal 5:17.

praesciit, praedestinavit, et constituit qui conformes fierent imaginis filii eius, ut esset filius dei primogenitus in multis fratribus. *Quos autem praedestinavit, hos uocavit; quos uocavit, hos iustificavit, et quos iustificavit, ipsos et magnificavit.* Vnde et propheta dicit: *non est in homine uia eius.* Quid putatis uos, o fragiles, o caduci, miseri et mortales homines, si quid bene agitis, esse laudandos, aut forte delinquentes prorsus esse damnandos, cum ideo lex loquatur ut timorem incutiat? Ceterum nihil fit, nisi quod uoluerit deus. Quem uoluerit deus sanctum esse, sanctus est, aliud non erit. Quem praescierit esse iniquum, iniquus erit, aliud non erit. Praedestinatio enim dei iam et numerum iustorum, et numerum constituit peccatorum, et necesse erit constitutum terminum praeteriri non posse. Haec autem non quasi personarum acceptor constituit, sed quasi praescius omnium futurorum. Non enim per conceptionem personae, sed per praescientiam deus praedestinationem suam fixit atque constituit. Iam quos praesciit nullo modo conuerti, hos praedestinavit ad mortem, quos praesciit omni modo conuerti, hos praedestinavit ad uitam.

3. Miror autem quod testimonia ueteris testamenti contra auctoritatem noui proferentes solent sancti Ezechielis prophetae testimonia usurpare dicentes: *haec dicit dominus: cum dixerim impio: morte morieris, et conuersus fuerit ab impietate sua, uiuo ego, dicit dominus, uita uiuet.* Hoc, ut dixi, in ueteri lege scriptum est pro tempore captiuitatis, pro causa qua ipsa captiuitas facta est, pro persona populi cui irrogata est, ut disceret in captiuitate positus pro peccatis suis se iugo Assyrii regis esse subiectum. Certe pro peccato captiuitas facta est, et ut quid simul captiuitatem iusti cum peccatoribus incurserunt, nisi quia mysteria dei a nostra fragilitate penitus sciri non possunt? Hoc ergo mysterium in ueteri lege scriptum est, in nouo autem apostolus clamat: *uasa irae apta in interitum.* Et ideo scriptum memorat deum dixisse per praescientiam suam: *Iacob dilexi, Esau autem odio habui.* Cum enim nondum nati fuissent, nec aliquid egissent boni uel mali, ex praescientia dictum est, quod unus haberetur odio, alius amaretur. Haec a nobis adiuuenta non sunt, nec dicimus aliquid praeter quam euangelizauit apostolus. Per praescientiam dei praedestinationem ipse factam commemorat. De deo ipse dicit: *quos uocavit, hos praedestinavit.* Si praescientem et praedestinantem et uocantem in apostolo legitis, nobis ut quid impingitis crimen ob hoc quod dicimus praedestinas deum homines, siue ad iustitiam siue ad peccatum, ne uideretur ipse

when he foreknew all things as if he had already seen them, he predestined them and also determined who one day would become conformed to the image of his Son, so that the Son of God may become the first-born among many brothers: *And those he predestined he also called; and those he called he also justified; and those he justified he also glorified.*<sup>4</sup> Hence the prophet says: *No one chooses their way, nor determines their course nor directs their own step.*<sup>5</sup> What do you think, you frail, ephemeral, wretched and mortal human beings? Do you think that if you do good you deserve to be praised, or perhaps that if you do evil you must indeed be punished, considering that when the Law speaks it does so in order to inspire fear? Nothing else can happen other than what God himself has willed. A person whom God wanted to be holy is holy indeed and will not be otherwise. One whom God has foreknown to be evil will be evil and not otherwise. In fact, God's predestination has already determined the number of the just and the number of sinners; necessarily, their established number cannot be altered. God did not establish these things by acting out of partiality toward certain individuals, but inasmuch as he has known in advance everything that will happen. In fact, God established and finalized his predestination, not out of partiality toward certain individuals but according to his foreknowledge. Those whom he already foreknew would not be converted in any way he predestined to death; those whom he foreknew would be converted in various ways he predestined to life.

3. I am surprised that by quoting some testimonies from the Old Testament against the authority of the New Testament they tend to misinterpret what the holy prophet Ezekiel says: *And though I say to the wicked that they shall die, if they turn away from sin and do what is just and right they shall surely live; they shall not die.*<sup>6</sup> As I said, this was written in the Old Testament in reference to the time when the Jews were deported as prisoners for the same reason the captivity itself occurred, namely for the benefit of the people to whom it was inflicted, so that those who were deported might know that they had been subjected to the yoke of the Assyrian king because of their sins.<sup>7</sup> Undoubtedly, this captivity occurred because of sin. Why did the just undergo captivity at the same time with sinners, if not because the mysteries of God cannot be entirely known by our frail human nature? This mystery was recorded in the Old Testament, but in the New Testament the Apostle talks about *vessels of wrath made for destruction.*<sup>8</sup> Therefore, the written text reminds us that God said through his foreknowledge: *I loved Jacob, but hated Esau.*<sup>9</sup> For although they had not yet been born and had not yet done anything good or bad<sup>10</sup> it was said on the basis of [God's] foreknowledge that one will be hated and the other loved. We did not make these things up, nor do we say anything beyond what the Apostle preached. He himself reminds us that God's predestination takes place through his foreknowledge. In reference to God, Paul said: *Those whom he called, he also predestined.*(a) If you read

<sup>4</sup> Rom 8:30.

<sup>5</sup> Jer 10:23.

<sup>6</sup> Ez 33:14,15.

<sup>7</sup> 2 Kgs 17.

<sup>8</sup> Rom 9:22.

<sup>9</sup> Rom 9:13.

<sup>10</sup> Rom 9:11.

sibi quasi non prouidus facere homines, qui facerent quod nolebat? Inuictus enim in sua uoluntate permanet deus, cum homo assidue superetur. Si ergo inuictum confitemini deum, confitemini et hoc, quia quod eos uoluit ille qui condidit, aliud esse non possunt. Vnde colligimus apud animum quia quos deus semel praedestinavit ad uitam, etiam si negligant, etiam si peccent, etiam si nolint, ad uitam perducentur inuiti. Quos autem praedestinavit ad mortem, etiam si currant, etiam si festinent, sine causa laborant. Nec hoc sine magisterio admittas euidentis exempli. Iudas quotidie uerbum uitiae audiebat, quotidie adhaesit domino, quotidie uirtutibus occupatus, quotidie ipsum dei filium monitorem audiebat, et quia praedestinatus est ad mortem, uno ictu subito interiit. Saulus quotidie persecutor, quotidie lapidator Christianorum, quotidie uastator ecclesiarum, et quia praedestinatus est ad uitam, uno ictu subito uas electionis est factus.

4. Quid ergo tu qui in peccatis permanes expaescis? Si te deus dignatus est, sanctus eris. Aut quid tu qui in sanctitate uiuis, sollicitus redderis, quasi tua te sollicitudo conseruet? Si deus noluerit, numquam uterque corrues. Vterque de deo securi estote. Numquid tu qui sanctus es, et sollicitus es ne corruas, et die noctuque orationibus ades, occuparis ieconiis, et diuinis lectionibus diligenter insistis, exhortationibus uacas, atque omnibus sanctis studiis quotidie immunes, numquidnam tuo hoc studio saluus eris? Numquid sanctior eris Iuda, qui accepit in potestate infirmos curandi, daemonia fugandi, mortuos suscitandi, *calcandi super serpentes et scorpiones*, collega apostolorum, Christi discipulus et tamen quia praedestinatus est ad mortem, mortem aeternam inuenit? Cessa de te, o homo, cessa, inquam, de uirtute tua esse sollicitus, et de dei tantum confide uoluntate securus. Nihil enim boni tu deo obtinebis inuito, sed si te dignabitur deus ut in bono permaneas, saluus eris. Tu quoque qui in peccato desperatione uana concuteris, disce a Paulo apostolo. Quis umquam par eius potuit sceleribus inueniri? Numquid tu aliquando peiora potuisti quam ille commisit perpetrare peccata? Et tamen, quia praedestinatus est ad apostolatum, euasit subito uniuersa crimina, et ab inferioribus inferis ad superna superiorum ascendit. Omnes itaque quos scit dignos salute redemptionis suae deus, hos ad salutem praedestinavit, et hos tantum saluat, quos se ad salutem praedestinasse cognoscit. Salus enim dei non uoluntati hominis seruit. Ipse enim scit cui quid faciat. Nec enim antecedit arbitrii humani libertas gratiam dei, sed antecedit gratia dei humani uoluntatem arbitrii. Vana est enim et infructuosa uoluntas hominis et uanum est humanae uoluntatis arbitrium. Errat qui se putat per id quod uult bonum peruenire ad Christum, cum ipse Christus dicat: *nemo uenit ad*

in the Apostle's letter that God foreknows, predestines and calls, why do you blame us for saying that God has predestined people either to justice or to sin, so that it may not seem that God, as if he hadn't already foreseen it, almost unwisely created for himself people who do what he doesn't want them to do? For God remains undefeated in his will, though a human being is constantly defeated. Thus, if we believe that God's will is not thwarted, we must also believe this, that since he who made people wanted them to be a certain way, they cannot be otherwise. Thus, we believe in our hearts that those whom God once predestined to life, even if they become negligent, or sin, or refuse to come along, are led to eternal life against their wishes. Conversely, we also believe that those whom God predestined to death, even if they run or hasten, they work in vain. Do not agree with what we are saying without first learning a lesson from an obvious example. Judas heard every day the word of life; everyday he was close to the Lord; everyday he practiced virtues; everyday he heard the Son of God give advice. However, because Judas was predestined to death, he died in one sudden move. (b) On the contrary, every day Saul acted as a persecutor, a stoner of Christians, laying waste to the churches;<sup>11</sup> however, because he was predestined to life, in one sudden move he was made a vessel of election.

4. Therefore, why do you, who dwell in sin, become frightened? If God considered you worthy, you will be holy. Conversely, why is it that you, who live in holiness, remain zealous as if your zeal had the power to save you? Unless God wanted otherwise, neither one of you will perish. Both of you must have confidence in God! Do you, who are holy and try hard not to perish, who offer prayers day and night, who engage in fasting, who diligently persevere in the divine reading, (c) who do not need constant exhortations, and who everyday pursue all kinds of holy studies – do you really think that you will be saved because of your devotion? Would you be holier than Judas, who received the power to heal the sick, to put demons to flight, to raise the dead, to walk over snakes and scorpions, who was a colleague of the apostles and a disciple of Christ, and who, however, because he was predestined to death, incurred eternal damnation? O human being, cease to be zealous out of your own virtue and regard yourself safe thanks to God's will alone! In fact, you will not obtain anything good unless God wants you to; but if it will please God that you may persevere in goodness, you will be saved. You too, who are in sin, afraid and filled with a pointless despair, learn from the apostle Paul. Who can ever be found to equal his crimes? Could you possibly ever commit worse sins than he did? And yet, because he was predestined to be an apostle, he suddenly escaped [the eternal consequence of] all of his crimes and reached the highest highs from the lowest lows. (d) Therefore, all those whom God knows are worthy of the salvation issuing from his redemption, he predestined to salvation; thus, God saves only those people whom he knows he had predestined to salvation. Salvation depends on God's will, not on any given person's. God himself knows to whom this salvation applies. Nor does the freedom of human choice precede the grace of God, but rather the other way around: the grace of God precedes the will of human choice. For the human will is vain and of no avail, just like the choices stemming

---

<sup>11</sup> Ac 8:23; 26:10,11; Gal 1:13.

*me, nisi quem pater attraxerit.* Qui melius a Christo sapitis, dicite si mentitus est Christus, et ita demum asserite nos contra Christi regulam istam fixisse sententiam. Si enim uerum dixit Christus, non mentimur quod dicimus praedestinatos trahi ad uitam, quia uita ipse est. Quod si aggrauat uos uis testimonii euangelici, qui contra nostram uenitis sententiam, et non potestis aggrauii pondere sententiae nobis dare responsum, saltim apostoli nobis definitionem exponite, qui dicit: *non est uolentis neque currentis, sed miserentis est dei.* Quantumcumque igitur studii sui uires ad aedificandum moueat humana uoluntas, casso certamine nititur. Aut quid uigilantiam suam putat hominis fragilitas aeternis desideriis profuturam, cum propheta euidentibus exclamet documentis dicens: *nisi dominus aedificauerit domum, in uanum laborauerunt qui aedificant eam.* *Nisi dominus custodierit ciuitatem, in uanum uigilauerunt qui custodiunt eam?* Quid est quod contra diuinos apices et contra conscientiam suam sperat se quispiam aedificationi studere, cum his sacris apicibus doceatur aedificatio hominis non esse certa, sed uana? Sed si contra nos uenitis, non contra nos uenitis, sed contra eum qui dixit: *nisi dominus aedificauerit domum, in uanum laborauerunt qui aedificant eam.* *Nisi dominus custodierit ciuitatem, in uanum uigilauerunt qui custodiunt eam.* Ergo nescit quia non erat utile populo dei, qui haec fecit scribi, et per posteros usque ad finem saeculi dirigi? Vos itaque qui ista reprehenditis, auferite haec de libro Psalmorum, quia legentes et psallentes hos uersiculos, ut dicitis, aedificari non possunt.

5. Sed quid putant isti se uoluntate sua ad fructum posse aedificationis attingere, cum nec ipse uas electionis suam se asserat potuisse uoluntatem implere? Dicit enim de se ipso apostolus: *non quod uolo bonum hoc ago, sed quod nolo malum illud facio.* Si ergo apostolus quod uult bonum implere non praeualet, quomodo isti dicunt per uoluntatem suam ad fructum se posse gratiae peruenire? Apostoli uerba sunt, nostrum nihil adiungimus. Ipse de se dicit: *non quod uolo bonum hoc ago, sed quod nolo malum illud facio.* Et nos culpatis, quia dicimus: “non uocantur nisi praedestinati. Antecedit gratia dei uoluntatem hominis.” Prior est enim deus in bono hominis. Homo autem etiam si optimus sit, in omni bono uix nouissimus inuenitur. Date primas partes deo, ut superbiam euacuetis humanam. Quod si uolueritis superbiam nutrire hominibus, apparet uos ruinam generis humani perquirere, quia docetis in bono opere non deum antecedere, sed hominum uoluntatem, ut ipsi uideantur

from the human will. One who assumes that he/she can come to Christ through the good that he/she wants, since Christ himself says: *No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draw him*,<sup>12</sup> is mistaken. Now, you, who know better because of what Christ said, tell us if Christ lied: in this case, you may claim that we have reached our conclusion by going against this saying of Christ's. But if Christ told the truth, we are not lying when we say that those who are predestined are drawn to eternal life, since Jesus himself is eternal life. For if you, who react against our opinion, find that the strength of the evangelical witness is too much to bear, and being upset by it cannot give us an answer, at least explain to us the saying of the Apostle: *So it depends not upon a person's will or exertion, but upon God, who shows mercy.*<sup>13</sup> Therefore, inasmuch as the human will inspires people to act according to its own thoughts, it fights a lost battle. Or why is it that human frailty thinks that its own vigilance will further God's desires, when the psalmist warns us with clear words: *Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build. Unless the Lord guard the city, in vain does the guard keep watch?*<sup>14</sup> Why is it that one applies himself/herself to the task of self-edification, thus going against the divine scriptures and his/her own conscience, when the edification of a person is clearly taught in these inspired words not to be certain, but vain? But if you disagree with us, you are not really opposing us, but the one who said: *Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build. Unless the Lord guard the city, in vain does the guard keep watch.* Must we conclude that the person who ordered these things to be written down and to be followed through future generations until the end of time did not know that they were going to be useless to the people of God? Therefore, you who criticize these views, remove these words from the book of Psalms since, as you say, those who read and sing these verses cannot be edified!

5. But why do these people believe they can attain the fruit of edification through their own will power, when not even the vessel of election himself claims he was able to fulfil his own will? For the apostle said about himself: *For I do not do the good I want, but I do the evil I do not want.*<sup>15</sup> Therefore, if the Apostle, who wants to do good, does not succeed in accomplishing it, how can these people possibly say that they are able to attain the fruit of grace through their own will? The words are the apostle's: we do not add anything of ours to them. The apostle says about himself: *For what I do is not the good I want to do; no, the evil I do not want to do – this I keep on doing.* And yet you blame us for saying that people are not called unless they are predestined and that the grace of God precedes the will of human beings. God comes first in the good that they do; but a person, even an excellent one, is the very last factor in every good deed he/she does. Give the first part to God, in order to get rid of human pride. For if you want to feed one's pride, we may conclude that you are seeking the ruin of humankind, because you teach that in any good work what comes first is not God,

---

<sup>12</sup> Jn 6:44.

<sup>13</sup> Rom 9:16.

<sup>14</sup> Ps 127:1.

<sup>15</sup> Rom 7:19.

magis deum, ut bonum faciat, suis suggestionibus admonere, quasi qui non faceret bonum nisi ipsi dixissent, cum constet deum nullo sugerente, nullo rogante bona omnibus hominibus condonare. Non enim dixit apostolus: “cum rogaremus,” sed *cum inimici*, inquit, essemus, reconciliati sumus deo, non per uoluntatem nostram, sed per mortem filii eius. Vbi est ergo uoluntas hominis? Exclusa est. Quare? Quia non omnis qui uult, ipse saluatur. Quia si omnis qui uellet, saluaretur, nullus a salute poterat effici alienus. Omnis etenim homo saluari uult, sed non omnis saluatur homo. Saluatur autem is quem uoluerit deus. Vtique, inquam, is quem uoluerit deus, ut exclusa hominis uoluntate suam plenam ex integro gratiam manifestet. Quod si aliquem uult deus bonum esse, et bonus non est, ergo homo uincit deum. Vincit enim deum, si deus eum uult esse bonum et bonus non est. Deus ergo uoluntas et effectus est in bono hominis. Non enim cum rogaremus, neque cum peteremus, sed *cum inimici*, inquit, essemus, reconciliati sumus deo per mortem filii eius.

6. Cum autem *pro omnibus* mortem filii eius legitis, miror quomodo *omnes* intelligatis, cum paucos uix ad salutem cernatis attingere. Vbicunque autem *omnes* legitis, generaliter *omnes* uultis intelligi, cum *omnes* saepe pro parte doceantur. Nam cum dicitur: *omnes declinauerunt*, non tamen omnes declinauerunt, et *omnis homo mendax*, non tamen omnis mendax, quia de quodam legimus: “erat homo uerax.” Et illud: *uiri mendaces non erunt illius memores, uiri autem ueraces inueniuntur in ea.* Pars ergo maxima *omnes* uidetur significare, cum utique constet non debere omnes intellegi. Et hoc miror, quod clausis oculis transitis hostis insidias, uos qui dicitis uoluntatem hominis aliquid acquirere posse uirtutis, non attendentes quantae ruinae castitatis per diabolum fiant, quantaque crimina concupiscentiae, auaritiae, liuoris ac perfidiae quotidie perpetrentur. Quae utique si uideretis, non laboraremus uobis ostendere damna uirtutum, et uictorias uitiorum. Si integra enim esset libertas arbitrii, ista non fierent. Per praeuaricationem itaque primi hominis periit ab hominibus libertas arbitrii.

7. Sed uos haeresim Pelagianam iterum renouatis, cum dicitis per libertatem arbitrii homines finem ponere posse peccatis. Excluditis enim gratiam per libertatem arbitrii. Aut enim libero arbitrio liberamur, aut gratia dei eripimur. Eligite quid dicatis. Si

but rather a person's will. They teach this, so that they themselves, rather than God, may appear to heed their own suggestions to do good, as if God would not do good unless they themselves told him to, when instead it is obvious that God gives good things to everybody without any need on his part for people's suggestions or requests. The apostle does not say: *We were reconciled to God when we pray*, but *while we were enemies*; and again, not through our own will, but *through the death of his Son*.<sup>16</sup> So, where is the human will? It is excluded. For what reason? Because not everyone who wants to be saved will be saved; if that was the case, no one will be kept from being saved. As a matter of fact, everybody wants to be saved, but not everyone will be: only those whom God wants to be saved, will be saved. Certainly, I say, only those whom God wants to be saved will be saved, so that, excluding a person's will, God's explicit will may be manifested anew. Otherwise, if God wanted someone to be good and that person turned out to be evil instead, in that case we could say that a human being has triumphed over God. Indeed, a human being was able to defeat God if God wanted him/her to be good and that person, on the contrary, turned out to be evil. In that case, we rather say that God's will and desired outcome are found in the good that a person does. The apostle said that *we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son*, not when we beseech him and pray to him, but rather *when we were still enemies*.

6. When you read that the God's Son died *for all*, I am amazed at how you understand the word "*all*," considering that you can see that very few people attain salvation with great difficulty. Whenever you read the word "*all*," you want to understand it in a general sense, when in reality "*all*" often refers only to a part. In fact, when we read: *All have gone astray*,<sup>17</sup> that is not literally true. It is said: *All men are liars*;<sup>18</sup> however, that is not the case, since we read about Nathaniel: *Here is a true Israelite. There is no duplicity in him*;<sup>19</sup> and also: *Liars will never think of her* [i.e., wisdom]; however, *truthful people are found in her*.<sup>20</sup> (e) Thus, it seems that "*all*" refers to the greatest part, since it is obvious that the term must not be understood as "every single person." I am amazed at this, that with closed eyes you fall into the traps of the enemy, you who claim that a person's will is able to accomplish something virtuous. You do not realize how many lapses in chastity occur because of the devil, and how many sins of lust, avarice, envy and treachery are committed every day. If you saw things the way they really are, we would not endeavor to show you the defeats suffered by virtues and the victories of vices. If the freedom of the will was intact, these things would not happen. Freedom of the will disappeared from human beings through the transgression of the first man.

7. But you revive the Pelagian heresy when you say that through freedom of the will human beings can put an end to their sins. As a matter of fact, you exclude grace through freedom of will. For either we are liberated through free will, or we

---

<sup>16</sup> Rom 5:10.

<sup>17</sup> Ps 14:3.

<sup>18</sup> Ps 116:11.

<sup>19</sup> Jn 1:47.

<sup>20</sup> Sir 15:8.

gratiae totum dederitis, unum sapimus, si libero arbitrio, sciatis nos uobis consentire non posse. Vnde autem illi maior libertas arbitrii in bono, unde isti minor est, nisi quia dei dispensatione censentur? In alio enim tenuem se exhibet gratia, in alio abundantem et largam, prout ipsa uult gratia, non prout nos uolumus, qui a facturae nostrae ordine recessimus. In tantum denique uitiatam per praeuaricationem Adae hominis naturam agnouimus ut instaurationem suam per Christum non in re, sed in spe fuerit consecuta dicente apostolo: *spe salui facti sumus. Spes autem quae uidetur non est spes.* Si ergo spe saluati sumus, adhuc rem in praesenti saeculo non accepimus. Ideo denique baptizati iterum carnaliter concupiscunt, et illos motus corporis patiuntur, quia spe, non re consecuti sunt restorationis auxilium. Si enim re consecuti fuissent, post baptismatis gratiam non esset peccati nec possibilitas nec uoluntas. Verum quia uirtus baptismatis tanta est ut uniuersa peccata deleat, pullulatio tamen peccatorum baptismatis unda non abluitur. Inesse enim per Adam naturaliter perdocetur. Nam illa membra quae in baptismatis hora confusione parent, postea confusionem recipiunt, qua euitant ubique conspectum, et quaerunt pudendo secretum. Quae enim deus membra fecerat, praeuaricatio in pudenda conuertit, et non dicuntur membra, sed pudenda. Quae pudenda in puncto illo baptismatis membra fiunt, sed mox iterum pudenda efficiuntur ex membris. Non enim re, sed spe restaurati sunt. Concupiscentia enim carnis, quae per praeuaricationem Adae regnat in corpore tamquam lex peccati, iterum sibi uindicat baptizatum, totumque animum eius conatur euertere. Haec enim radix illius plague est, quam Christus saluauit. Saluauit autem sic, sicut apostolus dicit: *spe salui facti sumus.* Et iubet nos animum ad inuisibilia contemplanda transferre, nec de his quae uidentur praesumendo corrue. Et ideo dicit: *spes autem quae uidetur spes non est,* ne forte aestimarentur per baptismum ita tolli peccata ut etiam radices ipsae peccatorum pariter euellantur. Motus enim ille pollutionis, qui per praeuaricationem naturam inuasit, ita remanet in baptizato, sicut radix capilli, cum fuerit nouacula in superficie emundatus et rasus. Rasus enim est ut emundaretur locus, non est eradicator ne ulterius nasceretur. Si enim ex integro per baptismum omnis praeuaricationis Adae fragilitas tolleretur, baptizati omnes nullo caloris motu traherentur ad crimina, nullus sordibus inquinaretur humanis, nullus concupiscentiae stimulo pungeretur, sed quia *spe salui facti sumus,* quod adhuc non uidemus, *per patientiam exspectamus.* Veniet tempus in quo neque nubant neque uxores

are rescued by God's grace. Make up your minds: which is it? If you give everything to grace, we share a common view; but if you stake it all on free will, just know that we cannot agree with you. Where does the greater freedom of the will in doing good come from, and where does the smaller part come from unless it is deemed so by God's providential apportioning? In one person, grace appears to be small, in another person abundant and far-reaching, according to what grace itself sees fit, and not according to our wishes, as we are human beings who fell from the state of our original nature. We know that human nature has been corrupted due to Adam's transgression, so that its renewal will be accomplished through Christ not in reality, but in hope, as the apostle says: *For in hope we were saved. Now hope that sees for itself is not hope.*<sup>21</sup> Therefore, if we have been saved in hope, we have not received salvation in this present time. This is the reason why the baptized covet again in their flesh and are subject to the stirrings of the flesh; for they have attained the help of divine renewal in hope, but not in actuality. For if those who have been baptized had really obtained this help, neither the possibility nor the will to sin would continue to exist in them after receiving the grace of baptism. The truth is that, even though the virtue of baptism is so great as to take away all sins, nevertheless the water of baptism does not flush away the ongoing sprouting of sin; its growth continues in human nature through Adam. Those members of the body that at the time of baptism are not acting in a disorderly fashion, later on in life undergo turmoil, for they shun public sight and seek privacy, as they feel ashamed. Those things that God made as body parts, sin has turned into shameful parts, so that they are no longer called "members of the body" but *pudenda* (shameful parts). Those shameful parts at the time of baptism are made to be parts of the body, but soon enough shameful parts emerge from those members, since they were not removed in reality, but in hope. The concupiscence of the flesh that rules in the body just like the law of sin, because of Adam's transgression, once again reclaims the baptized person and endeavors to subvert his/her whole being. This concupiscence is the root of that plague that Christ healed, though he healed it in the way the apostle says: *In hope we were saved.* And he commands us to turn our minds to the contemplation of invisible things, and not to ruin our lives by making unwarranted assumptions about visible things. Thus, the apostle says: *Hope that is seen is not hope.* We should not think that sins are removed through baptism in such a way that even the roots of sin themselves are eradicated as well. In reality, the activity of corruption that crept into human nature as a consequence of the Fall remains in the baptized person just as the root of a hair remains in the head when the latter is cleaned and shaven at the surface with a razor. The hair is shaven in order to clear an area of the head; however, it is not uprooted and thus grows back again. For if the entire weakness of Adam's transgression had totally been removed through baptism, every baptized person would not be drawn to sin by experiencing arousal of passions; no one would be contaminated by human pollution; no one would be affected by the stirrings of lust. But since we are saved in hope, what we still do not see, we expect with patience. There comes a time when people will neither marry nor

---

<sup>21</sup> Rom 8:24.

ducant, sed sint sicut angeli in caelis. *Cum enim corruptibile hoc induerit incorruptionem, et mortale hoc induerit immortalitatem, tunc fiet sermo qui scriptus est: absorpta est mors in uictoram. Vbi est, mors, contentio tua? Vbi est, mors, stimulus tuus? Stimulus autem mortis peccatum, uirtus uero peccati lex.* Tunc dicemus: *deo gratias, qui dedit nobis uictoram per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum.*

be given in marriage but be like angels in heaven.<sup>22</sup> We read in the apostle's letter: *And when this which is corruptible clothes itself with incorruptibility and this which is mortal clothes itself with immortality, then the word that is written shall come about: "Death is swallowed up in victory. Where, O death, is your victory? Where, O death, is your sting? The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law."*<sup>23</sup> Then, we will say: *But thanks be to God who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.*<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Mt 22:30.

<sup>23</sup> 1 Cor 15:54–56.

<sup>24</sup> 1 Cor 15:57.

# LIBER TERTIUS

## Prologus

Finitus est liber inimicus hominum contra fidem catholicam confictus: liber dolosus circumdatus fallaciis, adulter integrae definitionis, qui que, ut sanctus Cyprianus ait, “falsa ostentat ut uera subripiat,” qui sub specie pietatis editus, agit contra omnium instituta sanctorum. Huius libri causa, ut memorauimus in praefatiuncula, omnium haereticorum in unum librum collegimus sectas, ut sciant defensores eius cunctis nos haeresibus aduersari, et nullius contra eos uti consensu. Ita que, o sancta mater ecclesia, purae fidei genetrix, contra occultos hostes tuos, contra nouos barbaros pacificum habitum mentientes, contra eos qui per te contra te arma corripiunt nostras uires exalta, et uolentes inire certamen adiuua, contra hos praecipue, contra quos adhuc nullus scribendo pugnauit, cum illi scriptis suis sub sacerdotis Augustini nomine totum paene iam uulnerauerint mundum, uitiatos libros proferendo, et uarias epistolas dando quas memorati Hipponensis episcopi esse configunt. Et uos, omnes catholicae fidei defensores, precibus exoramus ut exclusa omni occupatione, intentius nostrum proelium attendatis, et futurum iudicem iudicii uestri ante oculos habentes ex integro defendenda defendite, ex integro damnanda damnate. Cur autem intermissis aliis prauitatibus hunc librum in medium attulimus solum, haec ratio est, quia in modum eum symboli eis quos deceperint tradunt. Hunc ergo totum per ordinem credidimus scribendum, ne uideantur ea quae facile uinci poterant ex eorum libro fuisse disserpta, et illa callide praetermissa, quae ipsum librum poterant ab accusationis nostra in iuria uindicare. Nihil ergo praetermissimus, sed omne corpus eius his detegentes scriptis, gladium contra eum uerbi dei proferimus, atque in partes eum concidentes singula quaeque membra eius catholicorum oculis denudamus, ostendentes quae uenena in capite habeat, quae in ore tela contorqueat, quas ex pectore sagittas emitat, ac per singula membrorum officia aduersarietatis eius arguentes astutias, et captiuum eum ecclesiae catholicae pedibus prosternentes, omnibus eum facimus manifestum, ut ex hoc ipse sui damnator

## THIRD BOOK

### Prologue

Thus ends a misanthropic book, artfully written against the Catholic faith; a deceitful book, filled with fallacies and falsifying what has been established in an irreproachable way. This is a book, to borrow St Cyprian's words, that "displays lies in order to conceal the truth." (a) This book, written under the pretense of piety, goes against the principles upheld by all the saints. Because of this book, as I reminded [the readers] in my short preface, we gathered all types of heretical sects into one book so that its supporters may know that we oppose all heresies and that we do not refer to anybody's consensus in order to argue against them. Therefore, o holy Mother Church, who generated a pure faith in us, stir up our energy against these hidden enemies of yours, against the new barbarians who falsely display an irenic attitude, against those who take arms against you; help those who are willing to join the fight! This fight is waged mainly against these people, whom until now no one was willing to confront in writing, even though they hurt virtually the entire world with their writings, which they attributed to the priest Augustine: as they produced spurious books and various letters, they falsely attributed them to the famous bishop of Hippo. We exhort all of you, defenders of the Catholic faith, to participate more assiduously in this fight of ours. By setting aside every other task and by keeping before your eyes the future judge of the last days, once again defend what needs to be upheld and thoroughly condemn what needs to be condemned. The reason why, leaving aside all other depraved views, we have focused on this book, is that its supporters give it to those whom they have deceived as if it was an essential profession of faith. Thus, we have come to the conclusion that everything that follows had to be written for two reasons. First of all, that it may not appear that all those things that can easily be refuted had been removed from their book. Secondly, so that, having shrewdly left aside what they could from the sting of our criticism, they may not get away with it. Thus, we have omitted nothing; instead, in this book of ours we unmask their entire work and unsheathe against it the sword of the Word of God. Moreover, as we dissect it into various parts, we strip down every single part of it before the eyes of our fellow Catholics, showing what poisons are found in its head, what poisons grow in its mouth, and what arrows it shoots from its chest. We make this book known to everybody by refuting its cunning arguments through an analysis of the individual functions of the various parts and by casting it down at the feet of the Catholic Church, like a prisoner at the feet of his conqueror. This way, a person who, deviating from Catholic doctrine, wanted to damage their mind with the evil influence of this book,

existat, qui catholicam doctrinam deserens, consensum suum huius libri uoluerit contagione uiolare. Finit prologus, qui librum sub nomine Augustini confictum arguens, docet sequentem librum contra hunc pro defensione catholicae fidei dimicare.

1. Hactenus haereticorum omnium incensae sunt siluae, in quibus latrocinante perfidia diuitiae fidei peruersae sunt, praedam passa ecclesia, animarum sanguis effusus. Verum quia solitum est spinis post incendium iterum pullulare, falcem diuini iudicij teneamus, ut rediuiua et contra caelum euntia spinarum capita amputemus. Non deerunt, procurante deo, huic agro cultores, ut possint *beati immaculati in uia*, *immaculati in fide, qui ambulant in lege domini*, absque impedimento sentium peruenire quo pergunter.
2. Nonagesimam haeresim praedestinati fecerunt, ostendentes libros falsos quos Augustini configunt, cuius dicta in multis locis leguntur istis libris ualde contraria. Datur ergo catholicis uera suspicio quod tam scelerata dicta uiri orthodoxi esse non possint, quae dantes manus mathematicis dicunt humanum genus ita diuinis praedestinationibus subiacere ut mala omnia quae geruntur in saeculo, dei dicantur uoluntate committi. Ne ergo participes nos eorum timor humanus aut uerecundia faceret, omnium haereticorum egimus curas, et inuenimus neminem peius potuisse errare, quam hos qui dicunt mala omnia et crimina dei praedestinatione committi. Habeant ergo omnes haeretici unum librum, in quo eos non de potestate, sed de ratione uera damnauimus, ut sciant praedestinati nulli nos consentire haeretico. Habeant et praedestinati unum librum, in quo eos deus ipse conuincit, qui scit se nullum praedestinasse ad malum, omnes autem praedestinasse ad bonum, ut quod bonum est, ipsius comprobemus. Omnia enim bona quae faciunt nunc homines aut quae ab initio fecerunt uel facturi sunt, dei gratiae, dei clementiae, dei dicimus auxilio, dei etiam praedestinatione completa: praedestinatione autem, non qua uim faciat deus bonum nolentibus, sed quo ipse numquam mutet sententiam bonitatis, et incessanter sit bonum uolentibus promptus, malum autem uolentibus imparatus, siquidem uenientibus ad bonum, fidei eorum statim remunerationem exhibeat, conferendo indulgentiam peccatorum et dei filios faciendo, euntibus autem ad malum non statim poenam inferat quam merentur, sed expectationis suaue pias largiatur indutias. Hoc propositum dei praedestinatum confitemur et fixum.

ends up condemning themselves. Here ends this Prologue, which arguing against a book falsely written under the name of Augustine introduces the next book written in defense of the Catholic faith.

1. Until now the forest is ablaze with all types of heretics. In this “forest,” in which the riches of faith are being pillaged by the heretics’ cunning thievery, the Church is regarded as a prey, and the blood of souls is spilled. However, considering that after a fire the woods usually teem again with little brushes, we yield the sickle of divine judgement in order to cut down the newly grown brushes as they raise their branches to the sky. With the help of God, those who tend this field are not guilty of doctrinal errors, thus enabling *those who walk in the law of the Lord*<sup>25</sup> to be *blessed and blameless in their journey* and blameless in their faith. Thanks to them, it is possible for those who walk through such “forest” to arrive at their destination without having to contend with thorns.
2. The Predestinarians represent the ninetieth heresy. Its followers produce false writings that they allege were written by Augustine, whose sayings we find to be greatly contradicted in these books in several instances. Consequently, a legitimate suspicion arises among Catholics that such an orthodox man could not possibly have uttered these harmful sayings. These sayings agree with the [fatalist] views of the astrologers, who say that humankind is so much subject to divine predestination that [even] all evil things that take place in the world are committed because of God’s will. In order to keep a sense of intimidation and [misplaced] respect from turning us into their accomplices, we conducted a study of all heresies and discovered that no one could possibly have gone more astray than those people who claim that all evil things and crimes are committed because of God’s predestination. Let all heretics be included in one book, in which we condemn them not by resorting to authority but by employing true and rational arguments, so that the Predestinarians may know that we do not agree with any heretic. Let the Predestinarians too be addressed in one book, in which God himself refutes them, as he knows he has predestined no one to evil, but who, on the contrary, has predestined everybody to good (what kind of good, we will discuss later). We declare that all the good things that people do now, or did in the beginning, or will do in the future, are fulfilled thanks to God’s grace, mercy, help, and even predestination. This predestination, however, is not that with which God does violence to those who do not want good, but that in which he never changes his intention to do good and in which he is always available to those who yearn for what is good, while remaining unavailable to those who pursue evil. To those who come to the good, God immediately presents a reward for their faith by bestowing on them the forgiveness of sins and by making them his children. However, to those who incline their hearts towards evil he does not administer right away the punishment they deserve but grants them the merciful respite of his patient waiting. We believe that this plan of God has been predestined and irrevocably established.

---

<sup>25</sup> Ps 119:1.

3. Ergo dum mala fiunt, non deus suum propositum subduxit, sed homo suum contemptum induxit, nec deo uolente factum est aliquando peccatum, sed homine est negligente commissum. In tantum deo nolente humanum deliquit genus, ut semper peccata exercentibus irasceretur, et iustitiam agentibus subueniret. Denique, dum totus mundus a iustitia declinasset, et dignus esset diluui perire naufragio, docetur deus uoluisse eum per suam correptionem saluari. Nam quid est quod apostolus Petrus dicit: *exspectauit dei patientia eos qui increduli fuerunt in diebus Noe, cum fabricaretur arca?* Dicte nobis, quid exspectabat dei patientia? Numquid praedestinatam perditionem, an prouocatam conuersionem? Fabricatio itaque arcae diluui exstitit praedicatrix. Clamabat ascia, sonabat malleus, contestabatur serra, et ipsa infidelibus praedicabant ferramenta diluuium. Datis itaque centum annorum indutiis, praecessit lex, quae perituros diceret posse paenitendo euadere, quam non praedestinatio impediit, quae negaret posse corrigendo saluari. Si enim praedestinatio finibus suis terminum fixit, iniusta est lex quae fines cupit inuadere alienos. Ergo ut praedestinationem constituas, praecepta conuince. Da legi repudium, ut regnum praedestinationi inducas. Lex enim imperare omnibus semper uoluit et numquam ulli seruire. Si ergo praedestinatio imperium legis euacuat, et lex praedestinationis iura conturbat, una e duabus tyrannidem gestat. Eligite nunc, catholici, cui colla subdamus. Si legi, negemus praedestinationem ab imperio suo legem excludere, quia lex dicit: *custodi praecepta mea, et uiues.* Praedestinatio autem dicit: *uasa irae iam aptata ad interitum, et uasa misericordiae quae uocantur ad uitam.* Vtrumque scriptum est: quid nunc faciamus, eligit. Si iam sunt uasa irae aptata a deo ut peccent, et sunt uasa misericordiae aptata ad uitam ut uiuant, fundamus nos omnes praedestinationis imperio, et legem cum suis praedicatoribus expellamus. Et ne forte hoc ausu facinoris nouum putetis esse peccatum, fecit hoc ab initio omnis turba peccantium. Nam ut quid imperfecta est prophetarum et apostolorum et omnium turba sanctorum, nisi hac de causa, quia legem dei humanis sensibus ingerentes, arguebant in peccatoribus uitia? Qui si uoluissent adulationis uoce regnum praedestinationis inducere, exclusa lege iustitiae, nullus fuisset occisus. Dicebant enim illis, sicut scriptum est: *nolite praedicare nobis dura.* Quid est *nolite praedicare nobis dura?* Hoc est sine dubio: nolite nobis per legem comminantem praedicare supplicia. Illi ad haec: "si uos nostri temporis monitores audissent, habuerant illis in his uerbis

3. Therefore, when bad things happen, it is not because God has changed his plan, but because a person has showed their contempt; nor is a sin ever committed because of God's will, but rather because of a person's negligence. Against God's wishes, humankind has sinned; thus, he always gets angry with those who commit sin and comes to the aid of those who pursue justice. Finally, when the whole world turned away from justice and deserved to perish in the tragedy of the flood, we are taught that God wanted it to be saved through his correction. In fact, didn't the apostle Peter say: *God patiently waited in the days of Noah during the building of the ark?*<sup>26</sup> Tell us: what was God's patience waiting for? Was it waiting for a predestined destruction or rather for an encouraged conversion? Therefore, the construction of the ark foretold the coming flood. The ax chopped away, the hammer rang out, the saw gave witness, and the iron tools themselves announced the flood to unbelievers. After a truce of a hundred years, God's decree came, announcing that those who were about to die could escape by repenting. Predestination, which denies that people can be saved by changing their ways, did not oppose this decree. If indeed predestination established a limit to its own boundaries [by determining in an irrevocable way the number of the saved], then it follows that the divine precept is unfair, since it seeks to expand outside predestination's boundaries. Therefore, in order to establish predestination, you must show that the divine admonishments were not sincere. Go ahead then and reject the divine decree in order to usher in the kingdom of predestination! The divine decree always wanted to command everybody and never serve anyone. Therefore, if predestination dissolves the power of the [divine] decree and if the decree upsets the rights of predestination, one of them eventually ends up imposing its rule on the other. Make up your minds, o Catholics, to which one we should submit; if we submit to God's law, we must affirm that the law does not exclude predestination from its power, since the law said: *Keep my precepts and you shall live.* However, predestination says: "The vessels of wrath have already been prepared for destruction, likewise the vessels of mercy have been prepared for life." Both things are in writing: choose which one we should follow. Indeed, if the vessels of wrath have already been disposed by God to sin and if the vessels of mercy have already been disposed so that they may live, we all lay the foundations of the rule of predestination and do away with God's law and all its supporters. And so that you may not think that this is a new sin due to a daring action, remember that a whole crowd of sinners did this from the very beginning. Now, how come a great number of prophets, apostles and saints have been killed, if not for this very reason, namely that, having laid on people's minds the law of God, they reproached sinners for their vices? If they had wanted to usher in the reign of predestination by means of adulation, having excluded the law of justice, none of them would have been killed. For, sinners used to say to them, as it is written: *Do not preach to us hard things.*<sup>27</sup> (b) What does that verse mean? Undoubtedly it means this: "Do not preach to us punishments through a threatening law." Those people [i.e., saintly people] would say in response: "If those sinners would have listened to those warning you in our time, being seduced by these words concerning

---

<sup>26</sup> 1 Pt 3:20.

<sup>27</sup> Is 30:10.

adulando seruire, et, sicut uos facitis, per legis eos testimonia male interpretata decipere.”

4. [I] Hinc incipiunt uerba praedestinatorum: estote securi de ordinatione dei, quam praedestinando constituit: cui uult deus miseretur, et quem uult indurat. Non est enim uolentis neque currentis, sed miserentis est dei. Potestatem habet figulus lutu ex eadem massa facere unum uas ad honorem, aliud ad contumeliam. Caro aduersatur spiritui, spiritus carni: haec inuicem sibi aduersantur, ut non quae uultis ipsa faciatis. Iam praedestinavit deus quos praesciit, et quos praedestinavit, hos uocauit; quos uocauit, hos iustificauit; quos autem iustificauit, hos et magnificauit. Non est in homine uia eius. Quid putatis uos in eo quod bene agitis esse laudandos, cum ideo lex loquatur ut timorem incutiat? Ceterum nihil fit, nisi quod uoluerit deus. Quem uoluerit esse sanctum, sanctus est, aliud non erit. Quem praescierit esse iniquum, iniquus est, non erit aliud. Praedestinatio enim dei iam et numerum iustorum, et numerum constituit peccatorum, et necesse erit constitutum terminum praeteriri non posse.

Haec quae uos dicitis si dixissent, hominum quidem temporales euaserant iras, sed inuenerant dei aeterna supplicia. Non ergo hoc dixerunt, sed dixerunt: *haec dicit dominus: si uolueritis et audieritis me, quae bona sunt terrae edetis. Si autem nolueritis neque audieritis me, gladius uos comedet. Os enim domini locutum est haec.* Et iterum: *haec dicit dominus: quia uos recessistis a me, et ego recedam a uobis, et tradam uos Assyriis in depraedatione: filios uestros in conspectu uestro occident gladio, et uxores uestras abducent, quoniam contempsistis legem meam, et quae ego nolui eligitis.* Et iterum: *haec dicit dominus: numquid opprobrium factus sum domui Israel, quoniam me dereliquerunt, et praecepta mea et legitima mea computauerunt pro nihilo?* Et iterum: *quoniam uocaui et contempsistis, ego quoque in uestra perditione ridebo, et gratulabor dum uenerit super uos repentina calamitas.* Haec et his similia dicentes, diuersis sunt imperfecti suppliciis. Vnde et dominus ad populum ciuitatis in qua prophetae fuerant imperfecti, clamat tam in prophetis quam in euangeliis suis dicens: *Hierusalem, Hierusalem, quae occidis prophetas et lapidas eos qui ad te missi sunt, quotiens uolui congregare filios tuos, sicut gallina congregat pullos suos sub alis suis, et nolui!* Nolui, inquit, quod uolui, uolui quod nolui. Si ergo noluit deus quod illi uoluerunt, et uoluit quod illi noluerunt, aut coactus a potentiore alio praedestinationem constituit aut, si ipse constituit, calumniam fecit. Vt quid enim dicit homini: “hoc

predestination, they too would have followed their lead, and just as you do, they would have deceived other people through misinterpretations of the Law.” (c)

4. Here begin the words of the Predestinarians:

Be confident about God’s providential arrangement, which he has established by means of predestination: *He has mercy upon whom he wills, and he hardens whom he wills. So, it depends not upon a person’s will or exertion, but upon God, who shows mercy. Does not the potter have a right over the clay, to make out of the same lump one vessel for a noble purpose and another for an ignoble one?* The flesh is opposed to the spirit, and the spirit to the flesh. *These are opposed to each other, so that you may not do what you want.* God predestined those whom he foreknew, and those he predestined he also called; and those he called he also justified; and those he justified he also glorified. No one chooses their way. Do you think that if you do good you deserve to be praised, or perhaps that if you do evil, you must indeed be punished, considering that when the law speaks it does so in order to inspire fear? Nothing else can happen other than what God himself has willed. A person whom God wanted to be holy, is holy indeed and will not be otherwise. One whom God has foreknown to be evil, will be evil and not otherwise. In fact, God’s predestination has already determined the number of the just and the number of sinners; necessarily, their established number cannot be altered.

If the scriptures had said what you say, some people would have certainly escaped the temporal wrath of their rulers only to incur the eternal punishments of God. However, they did not say this but rather: *Thus says the Lord: If you are willing, and obey, you shall eat the good things of the land; But if you refuse and resist, you shall be eaten by the sword: for the mouth of the Lord has spoken!*<sup>28</sup> And again: *Thus says the Lord: Because you have departed from me, I too will depart from you, and hand you over to the Assyrians so that they may plunder you. They will put your sons to the sword before your eyes and take away your women, because you have despised my law and chosen to go against my will.* And again: *Thus says the Lord: Have I become an abomination to the house of Israel, considering that they abandoned me and kept my precepts and laws in little or no account?* And again: *Because you disdained all my counsel, and my reproof you ignored, I, in my turn, will laugh at your doom; will mock when terror overtakes you.*<sup>29</sup> As they said these and similar words, they were stricken with various punishments. Hence the Lord, both in the books of the various prophets, as well as in his Gospels, addresses the people of the city in which the prophets were killed, saying: *Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you who kill the prophets and stone those sent to you, how many times I yearned to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her young under her wings, but you were unwilling!*<sup>30</sup> In other words, he said: “You did not want what I wanted, and wanted what I did not want.” Therefore, if God did not want what they wanted, and wanted what they did

<sup>28</sup> Is 1:19–21.

<sup>29</sup> Pr 1:25,26.

<sup>30</sup> Mt 23:37.

uolui quod noluisti,” si scit se eum praedestinasse ne uellet? Secundum uestram blasphemiam excluditur reatus hominis, et appetit calumnia dei, et probatur innocens qui delinquit, et iniustus qui punit. Dolendum enim est peccanti potius quam irascendum, quia uim passus est a praedestinatione diuina, cum rueret ad praecipitia criminum. Hoc enim uoluit qui creauit. Qui enim creauit, ipse praedestinauit. Quod si ita est, constat non suum esse uitium omnino qui peccat. Si ergo non suum habet uitium omnino qui peccat, et constat a iusto deo extranea esse uniuersa quae damnat, cuius inuenitur factum, huius inuenietur esse peccatum. Nulla enim ratio patitur ut ubi alter praedestinator est, ibi alter praeuaricator esse dicatur. Nec recipit hoc boni et iusti aequitas, ut praedestinationem suam crimen faciat alienum. Ergo ut peccantem punias, ostende praedestinantem. Da auctorem praedestinationis, ut possis iudicem monstrare peccati, quia unum eundemque ostendere non potes praedestinantem atque damnantem. Si enim deus auctor est praedestinationis, et operum nostrorum ipse est constitutor, ostendite alium qui puniat praedestinata peccata, aut si quasi iustus iniusta humani operis facta condemnat, huius iniustitiae alium nobis praedestinatorem ostendite. Cui enim displicet factum, numquam potuit ab eo ut fieret constitutum. Perquam enim stultum est, si ipsum praedestinatorem eundem damnatorem operum confiteris. Nullus enim tam impius quam is qui rem a se praeordinatam exhorreat, et id puniat factum, quod ipse praeordinauit ut fieret. Nisi si forte, animo ad meliora conuerso, mutabilitate consilii, quod prius fecit iudicat esse damnandum: quod qui agit doctrina se melioris impellitur. Qui uero in omnipotentiae uirtute consistit, et nec parem nouit, nec superiorem metuit, dicite nobis, praedestinationem suam quo compellente damnauit? quia si praedestinati opera rea est, multo magis praedestinantis ordinatio criminosa. Si enim is qui praedestinatus est, per praedestinationem ipsam reus est, quanto magis ille cuius praedestinatio facta est, uocatur in culpam? Cauete, obsecro, ne haec adulterini seminis zizania casto ecclesiae dogmati aspergantur, quia peccatum non a praedestinante dirigitur, sed a delinquentе committitur. Recedant ergo uana argumenta uerborum. Nihil habent omnino commune praeuaricatio delinquentis et praedestinatio uindicantis, quia peccatum in uoluntate transgressoris est, praedestinatio autem in redemptoris est ordinata uirtute. Non enim aliud praedestinauit iste qui condidit, nisi ut secundum eius homo possit uiuere uoluntatem. Nefas est enim, et nimis est criminosum, ut prae- sumptio hominis ex dei credatur praedestinatione descendere, et delinquentis uitium praeordinatio futuri iudicis aestimetur.

not want, either he established predestination under compulsion of someone more powerful than himself; or, if he himself established predestination, he lied. For what reason does he say to a person: “I wanted what you did not want,” if he already knows he predestined him/her not to want it? According to your blasphemy, a person’s guilt is excluded, and God’s lie is manifested: the sinner is proven innocent, and God is shown to be unfair when he punishes. We should sympathize rather than get angry with someone who sins, because when they rushed headlong into the abyss of his sin, they suffered violence at the hands of divine predestination. In fact, this is what the creator wanted; he who created is also the same God who predestined.

If this is how things are, it appears that sin is definitely not the sinner’s responsibility. But if one who sins is not guilty at all (and we know that all things that God condemns are foreign to him), then it follows that human beings are the material executor of the deed, while God himself is responsible for the sin. No other alternative exists that when one is the predestinator, the other is said to be the transgressor. The fairness of a good and just God does not allow that somebody else’s guilt would determine his predestination. Thus, in order to punish a sinner, first show who is the predestinator. Produce the author of predestination in order to be able to show the judge of sin, since you cannot show that the predestinator and the judge are one and the same person. Thus, if God is the author of predestination and he himself is responsible for our works, show us another agent who may punish our predestined sins. Or, if he condemns the wrongful deeds of human works as if he was just, show us another predestinator responsible for a person’s injustice. He who does not like the deed was never able to keep it from happening. Therefore, it is foolish to say that the predestinator is the same person who judges our deeds. No one is so irreligious as the person who is appalled by something he himself predestined, and who punishes the deed that he himself foreordained to take place. Unless, by chance, having turned his mind toward better thoughts, since he is liable to change his mind, he now believes worthy of condemnation what he did before. Whoever does this is induced by the knowledge of one better than himself. Could it be that he who abides in the virtue of omnipotence, who knows no equals and who does not fear anyone greater than himself condemned his predestination because someone else compelled him? For if the work of a predestined person is reprehensible, the previous arrangement of the predestinator is much more blameworthy. For if one who is predestined to these things is guilty in virtue of this very predestination, how much more the one, whose predestination has been established, deserves to be blamed! Watch out, I beseech you, that this bad weed originating from a corrupt seed may not be mixed with the pure dogma of the church, for sin is not ordered by a predestining God but is committed by an erring person. Thus, may vain arguments built on mere words come to an end! There is absolutely nothing in common between the transgression of a sinner and the predestination of a punishing God; for the sin is found in the will of the transgressor, but predestination lies in the established virtue of the redeemer. The creator did not predestine anything else, other than people should live according to God’s will. It is impossible and rather vituperative to believe that human beings’ presumption is due to God’s predestination and to assume that the sin of the transgressor has been pre-determined by our future judge.

5. Occurrunt hoc loco, et dicunt:  
 per praescientiam deus praedestinationem suam constituit.  
 Nam quos praesciit nullo modo conuerti, hos praedestinauit  
 ad mortem, et quos praesciit omnimodo conuerti, hos  
 praedestinauit ad uitam.

Videamus nunc si non inquis ambagibus iudicium dei ad praeiudicium iustitiae trahitis. Ergo adhuc non sunt creati homines, et iam a iusto deo praeiudicium patiuntur? Videtur mihi quod alterum uobis inuenissetis deum qui tam impius sit ut a praeiudicio circumueniat humani generis massam, et nondum nati hominis merita dispungendo constituat, ac praedestinationis suae uinculo ad peccandum astringat, et cui adhuc conceptio non est, iam illi praeparet aeterna supplicia, et cui adhuc non dedit lucis huius labentis transitoria munera, iam illi perpetuas tenebrarum praeparet poenas. Quaerite uobis, ut dixi, alterum deum de quo ista dicatis. Nam hunc pium et clementem nostrum numquam ad hoc prouocabitis ut saltim blasphemii uestris commotus, etiam uobis hoc faciat. Nam qui uos patienter tolerat, nescio iam cui peccanti non parcat. Quotidie nobis iniuste agentibus subuenit, et recentioribus delictis subinde recentiora indulgentiae suae dona largitur, et uos dicitis: "iam ante mundi constitutionem indignatus nobis pro futuris peccatis praedestinauit sententiam." In praesenti se blasphemantibus ueniam tribuit, et uos dicitis: "iam tunc indignatus est contra peccatores, et praedestinauit eos ad mortem, quando prima liniamenta generationis humanae formauit." Iam ergo tunc egit iudicium mundi, antequam ipsum mundum statueret, ut iam post finem saeculi non inueniat quem punire. Laborem sibi forte uoluit tollere, et ne occurreret post facta sua homines iudicare, ante eos praedestinauit ad mortem, quam crearentur ad uitam. Et tamen, si ipse creauit quos praedestinauit ad poenas, praeuenit meritum occidendi, et qui adhuc non coepit uiuere, sententiam iam aeternae mortis accepit. Hoc deus noster numquam fecit: si uester est aliquis alias, ipsi istas irrogate blasphemias.

De deo autem nostro dicit propheta: uiuo ego, dicit dominus, quia cum dixero peccatori: "morte morieris," et peccator se abstulerit a uia sua mala et ab studiis suis pessimis, uiuo ego, dicit dominus, uita uiuet et non morietur in delicto suo quod fecit. Et si dixero iusto: uita uiues, et recesserit post haec a iustitia, uiuo ego dicit dominus, quia morte morietur. Iustitiae eius non liberabunt eum in die qua recesserit a iustitia et fecerit iniquitatem: in iniquitate sua morietur. Vides nostrum deum ex utroque latere et iustum monere, ne per securitatem corruat, et peccatorem alloqui, ne pro desperatione non surgat. Si alicubi uos legissetis de deo: "uiuo ego, dicit dominus, quia quem praedestinaui ad uitam

5. To this objection, they reply:

God established his predestination according to his foreknowledge. Those whom he already foreknew would not be converted in any way, he predestined to death; those whom he foreknew would be converted in various ways, he predestined to life.

Let's see if through this twisted reasoning you don't end up turning God's judgement into an unfair pre-judgement. Are you saying that people have not yet been created and they already suffer a pre-judgement from a just God? It seems to me that you have found another God for yourselves, who is so cruel as to impose on the entire humankind a pre-judgement; to establish the merits of people who are not yet born, by allotting them in a partial fashion; and to submit people to the yoke of his predestination. For a person who is not yet born, God prepares eternal punishments; or, if you prefer, for those to whom he has not yet given the ephemeral gifts of this feeble light, he already prepares the eternal sufferings of perpetual darkness! As I said, find for yourselves another God about whom you may say these things. For you will never challenge this holy and merciful God of ours to this point, that moved by your blasphemies, he will do these things to you too. He who patiently tolerates you, what sinner will he not spare? Every day he comes to our rescue, though we act in an unjust way, and immediately bestows the gifts of his bounty to those who have sinned. And yet you say: "God, before the creation of the world, being angry with us because of our future sins, has already predetermined our sentencing." He forgave those who blaspheme him in the present, and yet you say: "He is already upset with future sinners and predestined them to death at the time he was busy shaping the earliest features of humankind." Therefore, we must conclude that God already carried out the judgement of the world long before he established the world, so that he may not find after the end of the world any person to be punished. He wished to take away from himself that work, and in order to avoid judging people after their deeds he predestined them beforehand to death or to life. However, if he created those whom he predestined to punishment, it must follow that he anticipated the due reward of killing; and a person who did not begin to live already received the punishment of eternal death. Our God never did this. But even if your God is someone else, you are still blaspheming him.

Concerning our God, the prophet said: *As I live – oracle of the Lord God – though I say to the wicked that they shall die, if they turn away from sin and do what is just and right... they shall surely live; they shall not die. Even though I say to the just that they shall surely live, if they, relying on their justice, do wrong, none of their just deeds shall be remembered; because of the wrong they have done, they shall die.*<sup>31</sup> You can see that our God in both cases admonishes the just so that they may not fall due to their overconfidence, and encourages the sinners, so that they may not give up out of despair. I wonder why some people among you read the text as if it said: "As I live,

---

<sup>31</sup> Ez 33:13–15.

aliud non erit, et quem praedestinaui ad mortem, sine dubio morietur,” quis uos ferret ista docentes? Ecce contra sententiam uestram deus loquitur, et ipsi deo de se testimonium danti non creditis. Nec iustus securus sit, inquit, si dixero ei: “uita uiues,” quia si recesserit a iustitia, in iniquitate morietur, et cum dixerim peccatori: “morte morieris,” et conuersus fuerit, uiuo ego, dicit dominus, iniquitatum eius non recordabor, uita uiuet. Nolo enim mortem morientis, tantum ut conuertatur et uiuat.

6. Occurrunt nobis iterum clamantes:  
hoc in ueteri lege scriptum est, in nouo autem apostolus  
clamat: *uasa irae aptata in interitum.*

Ergo si ante aduentum pietatis pietas iam exuberabat, quanto magis nunc, ubi pietas ipsa pro impiis sententiam impietatis accepit, ut impios a reatu suo absolveret, et eos ad indulgentiae gratiam reuocaret! Videamus ergo uasa irae quo ordine aptentur in interitum. Audi apostolum, non dei praeordinationi hoc, sed hominis negligentiae uel diligentiae applicantem. *In magna, inquit, domo non sunt tantum uasa aurea et argentea, sed et lignea et fictilia, et quaedam quidem sunt in honorem, quaedam autem in contumeliam.* *Si quis ergo mundauerit semetipsum ab his, erit uas in honore sanctificatum, utile deo ad omne opus bonum paratum.* Ergo *uasa aptata irae in interitum* si se mundauerint ab his pro quibus aptata sunt in interitum, erunt uasa in honore sanctificata, et deo utilia ad omne opus bonum parata, secundum quod supra dixit ad prophetam: *cum dixerim peccatori: morte morieris,* hoc est, cum dixerim: “eris uas aptatum ad interitum,” et hic peccator conuerterit se ab iniquitate sua, hoc est, cum sit uas aptatum ad interitum, mundauerit semetipsum ab his, erit uas in honore sanctificatum. Postea quam hinc eos superaueris, ad obscuriora loca scripturarum configuiunt ut sagittent in obscuro rectos corde.

7. [II] Nescitis, inquiunt, quia scriptum est:  
*Iacob dilexi, Esau autem odio habui?* Cum enim nondum nati fuissent, nec aliquid egissent boni uel mali, ex praescientia dictum est ut unus haberetur odio, alias amaretur.

says the Lord, one whom I predestined to life will not be otherwise, and one whom I predestined to death will most certainly die.” Lo, God speaks against your view and you yourselves show that you do not believe God when he gives testimony about himself: “Not even the just person will be safe – God said – if I say to them: ‘You will abide in life,’ because if they withdraw from justice they will die in their iniquity; and, having said to a sinner, ‘You will die,’ and then he/she repents, as I live, says the Lord, I will not remember his/her iniquity and he/she will live.” In fact, we read: *I take no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but rather that they turn from their ways and live.*<sup>32</sup>

6. The believers in predestination rise up against us, saying:

This mystery was recorded in the Old Testament, but in the New Testament the apostle talks about *vessels of wrath made for destruction*.<sup>33</sup>

However, if mercy already overflowed before the advent of mercy, how much more it will overflow now, after mercy has taken upon itself the punishment on behalf of sinners, so that God may absolve sinners from their transgressions and call them to receive again the grace of forgiveness! Now, let us see in what sense the vessels of wrath are prepared for destruction. Listen to the Apostle, who applies this saying not to God’s fore-ordination, but either to the negligence or to the diligence of human beings: *In a large household there are vessels not only of gold and silver but also of wood and clay, some for lofty and others for humble use. If anyone cleanses himself of these things, he will be a vessel for lofty use, dedicated, beneficial to the master of the house, ready for every good work.*<sup>34</sup> Therefore, if the vessels of wrath prepared for death purify themselves from the things for which they have been prepared for destruction, they will become vases sanctified in honor, useful to God and ready for every good work. According to what God said to the prophet in the above-mentioned passage: *When I say to the wicked: You will die,*<sup>35</sup> this is to be understood in the sense I have described: *You will be a vessel prepared for destruction.* However, if the sinner will repent of their iniquity while they are still vessels prepared for destruction and purify themselves from these things, then they will become vessels sanctified in honor. At this point, after you defeat their argument, they take refuge in more difficult parts of Scriptures in order to treacherously strike at the heart of the righteous.

7. They say:

Don’t you know that it is written: *Jacob I have loved, but Esau I hated.*<sup>36</sup> For although they had not yet been born and had not yet done ‘anything good or bad,’ it was said on the basis of [God’s] foreknowledge that one will be hated and the other loved.

<sup>32</sup> Ez 33:11.

<sup>33</sup> Rom 9:22.

<sup>34</sup> 2 Tim 2:20,21.

<sup>35</sup> Ez 33:14.

<sup>36</sup> Mal. 1: 2–3 / Rom. 9:13.

Necesse nobis erit in hoc loco de lumine sacrae legis interpretatiunculae huius lumen incendere, ut detegamini non ad aliud in obscuris locis uos figere, nisi ut simpliciter ambulantes expolietis catholicos uestitu deaurato, et induatis eos pannis haereticorum sordibus plenis. In Geneseos libro de Rebecca dictum est: *duae gentes et duo populi de tuo utero prodient, et populus populum superabit, et maior seruiet minori.* Prophetia ergo non de his est qui secundum carnem nascebantur, sed de duobus populis Iudeorum et gentium, in quo maior populus Iudeorum seruiet minori, id est gentium. Sic enim et sequitur apostolus: *a praesciente, inquit, dictum est quia maior seruiet minori.* Vt quid hoc dixisti, o beate Paule apostole? Peto ut respondeas. Numquidnam propterea hoc dixisti, ut praedestinatio praeiudicium nascituris afferret? Respondit apostolus: “ego propter hoc dixi: *maior seruiet minori*, ut electio ex gentibus fieret.” Ergo si prophetiae huius mysterium nobis interpretatur apostolus, tu quis es qui aliter quam explanauit nobis magister uerus istum sensum exponas, cum scias dictum ab eo quod *si angelus de caelo euangelizauerit uobis, praeter quam euangelizauimus uobis, anathema sit?*

8. [III] Occurrunt hoc loco renouato certamine dicentes: nos non dicimus praeter quam euangelizauit apostolus. Per praescientiam dei praedestinationem factam ipse commemorat. De deo ipse dicit: *quos uocauit, hos praedestinauit.* Si praescientem et praedestinatrem et uocantem in apostolo legitis, nobis ut quid impingitis crimen?

Nos uobis crimen non impingimus, sed probauimus. Siue enim uos peritos dicatis, arguimus non sic sensus apostolicos uos debere concidere, siue uos probetis imperitos, increpamus non scientes praesumere non debere, et eius rei magisterium polliceri, cuius numquam uoluistis esse discipuli. Vos enim si uoluissetis discere prius, et sic docere, ab istis interpretationibus fugientes, a dei aequitate numquam recesseratis, nec diceretis quia non *omnes homines uult saluos fieri.*

Apostolus autem legis peritus noster, omnibus se omnia factum dicit, ut omnes lucrifaceret peccatores. Iam enim didicerat quia *conclusit deus omnia in incredulitate, et uult ut omnibus misereatur.*

At this point, it will be necessary on our part to shed light on this inadequate interpretation of yours, using the light of God's sacred law, as far as this passage is concerned. We intend to do so in order that it may become apparent that in difficult scriptural texts you do nothing else but strip Catholics of their noble clothes and cover them with the dirty rags of the heretics. In the book of Genesis it is written about Rebecca: *Two nations are in your womb, two peoples are separating while still within you; But one will be stronger than the other, and the older will serve the younger.*<sup>37</sup> This prophecy does not concern those who are born according to the flesh but rather the two groups of Jews and Gentiles: in this sense, the greater people of the Jews will serve the lesser people, namely the Gentiles. Thus, the Apostle was able to say: *By his call she was told, The older shall serve the younger.*<sup>38</sup> In what sense did you say this, o blessed Paul? I beg you to answer me. Could it be that you meant this, namely that predestination will bring a pre-judgement to those who one day will be born? This is how the apostle answers: "The foreknowing God said: *The greater will serve the lesser* in this sense, namely that the election will come from the Gentiles." Therefore, if the apostle interprets for us the mystery of this prophecy, who are you to expound this meaning in a different way than the teacher did, especially when we remember what he wrote: *But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach [to you] a gospel other than the one that we preached to you, let that one be accursed!*<sup>39</sup>

8. They argue against this passage with renewed ardor, saying:

We do not say anything beyond what the Apostle preached. He himself reminds us that God's predestination takes place through his foreknowledge. In reference to God, Paul said: *Those whom he called, he also predestined.* If you read in the Apostle's letter that God foreknows, predestines and calls, what do you fault us with?

We do not accuse you of a crime, but rather prove you guilty! Unless you claim to be biblical experts, we insist that you should not misinterpret in this way the meaning conveyed by the apostle. Otherwise, unless you cherish the opinion of incompetent people, we suggest that ignorant people should not act as if they were competent and refrain from proposing the teaching on that matter with which you never wanted to agree in the first place. Had you really wanted to learn first and to teach in this way and also to reject these interpretations, you would have never strayed from God's justice, nor would you have said that God does not want all people to be saved.

But the apostle, our expert on the matter, says that he became all things to all people in order to win sinners over.<sup>40</sup> He said this because God enclosed all things in unbelief and wished to be merciful to everybody.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Gen 25:23.

<sup>38</sup> Rom 9:12.

<sup>39</sup> Gal 1:8.

<sup>40</sup> 1 Cor 9:22.

<sup>41</sup> Rom 11:32.

Didicerat quod omne os deberet obstrui, et subditus deberet fieri omnis mundus deo, et ideo dicebat: dico autem per gratiam quae data est mihi, omnibus qui in uobis sunt. Et iterum: corripientes omnem hominem et docentes. Et iterum: idem deus diues in omnibus uobis. Et iterum: apparuit gratia dei omnibus hominibus erudiens nos et docens, ut sit omnis homo perfectus in Christo. Et quia sciebat filium dei pro omnibus natum, pro omnibus passum, ideo clamabat dicens: hoc placitum est coram saluatore nostro deo, qui uult omnes homines saluos fieri et in agnitionem ueritatis uenire. Vnde etiam cotidie nobis in euangeliis suis ipse dominus clamat dicens: uenite ad me, omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego uos requiescere faciam. Vnde ut doceret se nullum hominem a sua largitate repellere, promptus, liberalis, abundans, numquam minus faciens, loquitur in euangeliis suis dicens: omnis qui petit accipit, et qui quaerit inuenit, et pulsanti aperietur. Nam et scriptura ueteris testamenti omnes ad audiendum gentes inuitans dicebat: audite omnes qui habitatis orbem, quique terrigenae et filii hominum, simul in unum diues et pauper. Et ideo idem apostolus uidens quia omnes homines uult deus, non tamen omnes homines deum uolunt, futurum iudicium memorans clamat dicens: omnes nos oportet manifestari ante tribunal Christi ut recipiat unusquisque propria corporis, prout gessit, siue bona siue mala. Vnde et apostolus Petrus: gratia, inquit, dei super omnes et in omnibus uobis. Prophetae omnes uocant, apostoli omnes uocant, Christus omnes uocat, in toto orbe terrarum sacerdotes dei innumerabiles omnes uocant ad gratiam et ad misericordiam dei et ad indulgentiam. Soli duo aut tres homunciones, caecum habentes cor, egrediuntur cum his libris apostaticis, quos uiri catholici esse configentes, totum uulnerant mundum, quibus nouum genus blasphemiae inducentes dicunt quod deus non omnes homines uult saluos fieri, et in agnitionem ueritatis uenire, atque unius loci obscuritatem passi, tanto lumini tamque immenso splendori tenebrarum suarum uolunt inferre caliginem. Sed quia lux lucet in tenebris, et tenebrae eam non ualent comprehendere, iuuante domino ex eius thesauris accipientes, locum quem putant haeresi suaue manum porrigere explanemus.

Paul came to believe that every mouth must be silenced and that the whole world must be subjected to God,<sup>42</sup> and thus he said: *For by the grace given to me I tell everyone among you;*<sup>43</sup> and again, *admonishing everyone and teaching everyone;*<sup>44</sup> and again, *the same Lord is Lord of all, enriching all,*<sup>45</sup> and again, *For the grace of God has appeared, saving all and training us,*<sup>46</sup> “so that one who belongs to God may be competent, equipped for every good work.”<sup>47</sup> And since he knew that the Son of God was born and suffered for everyone, he argued: *This is good and pleasing to God our savior, who wills everyone to be saved and to come to knowledge of the truth.*<sup>48</sup> Hence, the Lord himself in his Gospels tells us every day: *Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will give you rest.*<sup>49</sup> Hence, in order to teach that he does not keep away any person from his bounty, since he is available, generous, rich in mercy; and in order to teach that he never does less than what he is able to do, Jesus uttered these words in his gospels: *For everyone who asks, receives; and the one who seeks, finds; and to the one who knocks, the door will be opened.*<sup>50</sup> The Old Testament, inviting all people to listen, said: *Hear this, all you peoples! Give ear, all who inhabit the world, You of lowly birth or high estate, rich and poor together.*<sup>51</sup> Therefore, the apostle too, seeing that God wants all human beings, but that not all people yearn for God, with an eye to the coming judgement, says: *For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each one may receive recompense, according to what he did in the body, whether good or evil.*<sup>52</sup> The apostle Peter talks about *The grace of God over and in all of you.* (d) The prophets, the apostles and Christ himself call everybody: in the whole world, countless priests of God invite people to receive the grace, mercy and forgiveness of God. Only two or three fools, having a blind heart, depart from the truth in these apostate books of theirs, which Catholic believers repute to be spurious and harmful to the whole world. In these books, as they introduce a new type of blasphemy, they claim that God *does not want everyone to be saved and come to knowledge of the truth.* Overcome by the obscurity of one scriptural passage, they want to superimpose this obscurity to such great light. But since *the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it,*<sup>53</sup> with the help of the Lord, drawing from his treasures, we will explain the passage which they believe lends support to their heresy.

Let us now talk about foreknowledge and predestination. God foreknew and foretold us that in the seed of Abraham, that is, in Christ, all peoples were going to be blessed. As this took place, the Jews put up with it rather unhappily. For this

<sup>42</sup> Rom 3:19.

<sup>43</sup> Rom 12:3.

<sup>44</sup> Col. 1:28.

<sup>45</sup> Rom 10:12.

<sup>46</sup> Tt 2:11.

<sup>47</sup> 2 Tim 3:17.

<sup>48</sup> 1 Tim 2:3,4.

<sup>49</sup> Mt 11:28.

<sup>50</sup> Mt 7:8.

<sup>51</sup> Ps 49:2,3.

<sup>52</sup> 2 Cor 5:10.

<sup>53</sup> Jn 1:5.

Dicamus nunc et de praescientia et de praedestinatione. Praesciit deus et praedixit quod in semine Abrahae, hoc est in Christo, benedicerentur omnes gentes. Quod, dum fieret, Iudei satis moleste ferebant. Nam ideo comprehendebant apostolos, et in custodiis retinebant, dicentes eis: praediximus uobis ne praedicaretis hoc nomen. Vos autem replestis omnes doctrina uestra. Apostolus ergo Paulus, uidens Iudeos in eo deficere quod gentes introirent ad fidem, et excluderent Iudeos a priuilegio synagogae per priuilegium ecclesiae, alloquitur eos ut non contristentur dicens: “quid nunc prohibetis nos gentibus loqui, ne saluae fiant, cum sciatis deum dixisse ad Abraham quod in semine tuo hereditabo omnes gentes?” Praesciit enim deus quod filium eius essent negaturi Iudei, et essent ei gentium populi credituri, et ideo ait: quos praesciit, et praedestinavit conformes fieri imaginis filii sui, ut sit ipse primogenitus in multis fratribus. Iudei enim per circumcisionem filii Abrahae docentur, gentes autem per baptismum filii dei fiunt, et est illis frater primogenitus filius dei. Vnigenitus, inquam, specialiter filius dei, frater fit eorum qui generaliter filii dei adoptantur. Vnde et dicit patri: narrabo nomen tuum fratribus meis. Hos ergo gentium populos praesciit, ut diximus, quod filium suum quem Iudei crucifixuri erant, sincero corde susciperent, et, ut decebat, dei filium adorarent: quos ergo praesciit, et praedestinavit conformes fieri imaginis filii sui, ut filius eius esset primogenitus in multis fratribus, hos praedestinavit. *Quos autem praedestinavit, hos uocauit.* Si interrogas apostolum: “quando praedestinavit?”, dicit tibi: “tunc quando dixit Abrahae: *in semine tuo hereditabo omnes gentes*, et ideo etiam per prophetiam dicitur: *audite haec, omnes gentes.*” Dicit ergo Iudeis: “nihil nouum uobis uideatur fecisse deus, qui uoluit promissum patri nostro Abrahae complere quod promiserat, ut in semine eius hereditentur omnes gentes.” Ergo quia omnes gentes praedestinavit, omnes gentes conclusit in incredulitatem ut omnibus misereatur. Ergo *quos praedestinavit, hos uocauit; quos uocauit, hos iustificauit* auferendo uniuersa peccata. *Quos autem iustificauit, ipsos et magnificauit*, id est filios dei fecit. Quid ergo murmurantes estis, o Iudei, prohibentes nos gentes alloqui? *Si deus pro nobis, quis contra nos?* Id est, quid in nos mittitis manus, et in apostolos dei scandalum patimini? Si enim deus *filio suo non pepercit, sed pro omnibus nobis tradidit eum*, nota tibi, praedestinate, quid dicat: *sed pro omnibus tradidit eum.* Dicendo *pro omnibus tradidit eum*, et Iudeis amputauit scandalum, et uestram intentionem exclusit.

reason, they arrested the apostles and kept them in custody, telling them: *We gave you strict orders [did we not?] to stop teaching in that name. Yet you have filled Jerusalem with your teaching.*<sup>54</sup> But the apostle Paul, seeing that the Jews were not successful, considering that many people came to the faith and swayed fellow Jews from the privilege of the synagogue through the privilege of the church, encouraged his fellow Jews not to become upset, wondering why they were *trying to prevent us from speaking to the Gentiles that they may be saved,*<sup>55</sup> when they knew that God said to Abraham: *In your offspring all the families of the earth shall be blessed.*<sup>56</sup> God foreknew that one day the Jews would deny his Son and that the Gentiles would believe in him. This is why he said: *For those he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, so that he might be the firstborn among many brothers.*<sup>57</sup> The Jews are taught that they become sons of Abraham through circumcision, but the Gentiles become children of God through baptism and their brother is the first-born Son of God. The only-begotten Son of God, who is the Son of God in a special way, becomes the brother of those who, in a general way, are adopted to be the sons of God. Hence, he said to the Father: *I will proclaim your name to my brethren.*<sup>58</sup> Like I said, God foreknew those people among the Gentiles who would accept with sincere heart his Son (whom the Jews were going to crucify) and who would worship the Son of God as it was fit and proper. Those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he may be the first-born among many brethren. *Those whom he predestined, he also called.* If you could ask the apostle when did God predestine, he would answer you: “When God said to Abraham *In your seed I will inherit all peoples.*” (e) And because of this, he said through the prophet: *Hear this, all you peoples!*<sup>59</sup> This is why the apostle said to the Jews: “You do not think that God did anything new when he wanted to fulfill the promise he had made to our father Abraham, namely that in his seed all people will be inherited.” Thus, since he predestined all people, he “delivered all to disobedience, that he might have mercy upon all.” (f) Hence, *those whom he predestined he also called and justified*, removing all their sins. *But those whom he justified, he also glorified*, meaning, he made them children of God. Why is it that you murmur, O Jews, forbidding us Gentiles to talk? *If God is for us, who can be against us?*<sup>60</sup> In other words, why do you raise your hands against us and are scandalized by God’s apostle? For, if he *did not spare his own Son but handed him over for us all*<sup>61</sup> then you, predestined one, ought to take heed of what Paul says: *He was handed over for us all.* By saying this, namely that God *gave him up*

54 Ac 5:28.

55 1 Thess 2:16.

56 Ac 3:25.

57 Rom 8:29.

58 Ps 22:23.

59 Ps 49:2.

60 Rom 8:31.

61 Rom 8:32.

Miror autem prudentiam uestram sic legisse locum istum: *quos praedestinavit, hos vocavit*, ut ad unum uersiculum qui in ante est timuissetis accedere. Quod enim uenistis ad hunc locum, quasi satisfactum putantes intentioni uestrae, noluitis in ante ad uersiculum qui uos conuincebat aspicere, id est *pro omnibus tradidit eum*, sed clausistis codicem, et coepistis clamare: “non omnes uocat deus ad gratiam suam, non omnes inuitat.” Et dicentibus nostris: “ergo non omnes uocat?”, uos respondistis: “non omnes uocat.” Stupentes itaque nostri atque anxiantes, eo quod audirent quod nullus umquam haereticorum dixerat, interrogauerunt peritiam uestram dicentes: “unde probatis quia non omnes uocat deus ad gratiam suam? Ipse deus non uult eos uocare? an uult et non potest? an non merentur? Si uult et non potest, blasphematur impotens. Si potest et non uult, uidetur iniquus. Si ipsi non merentur, ergo iam gratia non est gratia, et res meriti humani est uocatio, non gratiae dei. Si autem gratiae dei est et non meriti hominis, omnes uocat. *Omnes enim peccauerunt et egerunt gloria dei*, ut dicit apostolus, et adiecit: *iustificati itaque gratis in gratia ipsius in redemptionem quae est in Christo*. Ecce gratis, ecce et redemptio.” Audenter dico: “ubi est praesumptio de merito humanitatis, non est gratia diuinitatis.” Omnia enim quae gratiae dei esse credimus, meritis nostris applicare non possumus. Ergo si gratiae est et non meriti, quomodo uos dicitis aliquos non uocari, quia sunt eius uocatione indigni? Si enim nullus ex suo merito uocatur, sed ex dono gratiae dei, et alias uocatur, alias recusatur, personarum deus blasphematur acceptor. Arguuntur etiam apostoli eius falsi testes indicii. Nam beatus Petrus clamat: *in ueritate, inquit, comprei quia non est personarum acceptio apud deum*. Et beatus Paulus: *non est enim personarum acceptio apud deum*. Et iterum dominus dicit de seruis: *eadem, inquit, facite illis remittentes minas, scientes quia et uester et illorum deus in caelis est, et non est apud illum personarum acceptio*. Si ergo ita est, immo quia ita est, unde probatis quia non omnes uocat ad gratiam suam? aut quem non uult saluare qui pro crucifigentibus orat? In hac haerese diabolus tyrannidis suae furore grassatur, ut letali plaga paene uniuersum uulneret mundum. Infert bellum creatura creatori, et dicit ipsum praedestinasse quod punit, ipsum ut fieret constituisse quod prohibet. Quod quam sit impium, quamque sacrilegum quamlibet imperitus agnoscet. Omne enim peccatum tunc peccatum recte dicitur, cum et reatus delinquentis et aequitas iudicantis ostenditur, quia peccati supplicium praecedit semper meritum facti, reum autem nemo facit, nisi eum qui potuit

for all, the apostle removed what the Jews regarded as a scandal<sup>62</sup> and excluded your interpretation.

I am baffled that in your wisdom you have interpreted this verse in this manner: *Those whom he predestined he also called*, so that you were afraid to refer it to the following verse. But when you read this verse, believing that it vindicates your interpretation, you still intentionally avoided considering the previous short verse that convicted you, which reads: *He was handed over for us all*. Instead, you closed the book and began to shout: “God does not call everyone to his grace; he does not invite everyone.” To our people who asked: “Are you therefore saying that he does not call everybody?” you answered: “No, he does not.” Thus, when our people were stunned and troubled, since they heard you saying something that no heretic had ever said before, they questioned your biblical expertise, saying: “From what texts do you prove that God doesn’t call everybody to his grace or that God does not want to call them?” Could it be that God does not want or that he can’t? Or that they do not deserve to be called? If he wants and he can’t, God is blasphemed as powerless; conversely, if he can and does not want to, he appears to be unfair. But if people do not deserve it, it follows that grace is no longer grace and that election is a matter of human merit and not of God’s grace. However, if it depends on God’s grace and not on human beings’ merit, then God truly calls everybody. *All have sinned and are deprived of the glory of God*,<sup>63</sup> the apostle said, and then he added: *and are justified freely by his grace through the redemption in Christ Jesus*.<sup>64</sup> Here is grace and here is redemption! I dare to say: “Where we find presumption in the merits of humankind, there the grace of God is absent;” all the things that we believe are God’s graces cannot be attributed to our merits. Therefore, if it is of grace and not of merit, why is it that you say that some people are not called because they are unworthy of his election? For if no one is called because of their merits but thanks to the gift of God’s grace; and if one is called while another is rejected, God is blasphemed as a respecter of persons. In this way his apostles are shown to be false witnesses on this matter. For blessed Peter says: *In truth, I see that God shows no partiality*;<sup>65</sup> and blessed Paul says: *There is no partiality with God*.<sup>66</sup> Again, in reference to a master’s ways towards his servants: *Masters, act in the same way toward them, and stop bullying, knowing that both they and you have a Master in heaven and that with him there is no partiality*.<sup>67</sup> If that’s the way things are, or better yet, because this is how things are, where do you read that not everybody is called to his grace, or that Jesus, who prays for those who were crucifying him, does not want to save someone? In this heresy, the devil rages on with the fury of his power, hoping to inflict a lethal wound to the entire Christian community. The creature wages war against the creator and claims that God has predestined what he punishes, and that he has brought about what he himself forbade. The inexperienced

<sup>62</sup> 1 Cor 1:23.

<sup>63</sup> Rom 3:23.

<sup>64</sup> Rom 3:24.

<sup>65</sup> Ac 10:34.

<sup>66</sup> Rom 2:11.

<sup>67</sup> Eph 6:9.

declinare peccatum. Peccatum ergo inter praedestinantem et operantem discerne, ut illius factum malum hic, quasi alienum a se, aut damnet aut corrigat. A iusto autem deo aliena sunt uniuersa quae damnat. Vnde si praedestinatio in peccantem ostenditur, nihil iusto iudici probatur debere peccator, quia cuius asseritur praedestinatio, huius etiam operatio comprobatur. Vides ne, obsecro, quam grauiter blasphemetur his assertionibus deus? Si enim praedestinationis eius uis eo usque adducitur ut eius dicatur praordinatione peccatum, fructus malus non nisi ex impia radice procreatur.

Erit ergo secundum Manichaeum alius deus malorum, alius bonorum, ut quae bona sunt, bono ascribantur, et quae mala sunt, malo. Ne uideamur peius Manichaeis in clamare blasphemium, cum unum eundemque deum quem bonum confitemur et iustum, hunc praedestinasse omnia scelera aestimemus. Recedant igitur uana argumenta uerborum. Nihil habet commune praeuaricatio delinquentis et praedestinatio ulciscientis, quia peccatum in contemptu transgressoris est, ultio uero in iudicis aequitate consistit. Tollite itaque e duobus unum, aut iudici praedestinationem ut probetis iustum, aut alterum iudicem futurum ostendite. Nulla enim ratione constitutum suum poterit punire qui iudicat, quia si malum praedestinationi dederis dei, uoluntati hominis dare non poteris. Aut enim accusa reatum in homine, et tolle te a blasphemio dei, aut si praedestinationem a deo asseris constitutam esse peccanti, reatum quidem peccatori tulisti, sed deo crimen impingis. Certe peccatum certum est nihil aliud esse quam praeuaricatio hominis, et praedestinatio nihil aliud nisi ordinatio dei. Quomodo ergo tam diuersa sibimet tamque contraria ad unam compaginem uenire potuerunt, ut quod bonum dei est malum hominis fiat, et delinquentis uitium dicatur praeordinatio prohibentis? Illud autem cur non consideratis, qui praedestinatione dei putatis homines consentire peccatis? Omne certe peccatum uult et desiderat diabolus fieri, et creditis quod praedestinationem suam deus ad diaboli desiderium et ad hominis interitum posuit, et uoluit praedestinationem suam seruire uoluntati diabolicae ut ad libitus daemonum homines ante propriae uoluntatis meritum reos iam addiceret inimico? Hactenus blasphemias huius loci detexisse sufficiat. Pauido enim corde intolerabili tremore deficio. Octoginta et nouem haereses in primo libello conscripsimus: nullam ita hominibus ad crimina frena laxasse conspeximus, nullam sic blasphemias in deum astuentem inuenimus. Fateor, catholici confessores, crescunt eis in hac defensione blasphemiae. Peto itaque uestrae fidei puritatem ut dimicantem me uestris precibus adiuuetis contra hos agentem, quorum tota uerba blasphemiae sunt. Fateor,

cannot tell what is impious and even sacrilegious about this view. Every sin, in order to be rightfully called sin, occurs when both the guilt of the sinner and the fairness of the judge are manifest, considering that the gravity of the matter always precedes the punishment of sin. No one is guilty of doing something wrong except one who could also have avoided that sin. You need to distinguish between the predestining God and the active sin, so that God may condemn or correct the evil deed of a person, as if it was foreign to him/her. In fact, all the things that God condemns are alien to him since he is just. Therefore, if predestination is shown in a person who sins, the sinner is proven to owe nothing to a just judge. This is so because when the latter's predestination is upheld, the former's activity is also demonstrated. Don't you see, I entreat you, that God is greatly blasphemed by these claims? If the power of predestination is attributed to his foreordination in such a way that sin is said to be attributed to his foreordination as well, we must then conclude that an evil fruit necessarily grows from an evil root.

According to the Manicheans, one is the God of evil people, another is the God of good people; thus, those things that are good are attributed to a good God, and those that are evil to an evil God. Let us not appear to be uttering worse blasphemies than the Manicheans when we say that the same God whom we confess to be good and just has also predestined every crime. Enough with empty arguments built on words! There is nothing in common between the transgression of a criminal and the predestination of the one in charge of retribution; for sin lies in the contempt of the transgressor, but retribution resides in the justice of the judge. Choose one of the two: either show us the predestination of the judge, thus proving him to be unfair, or else show us another future judge. He who judges will not be able to punish with good reasons a person whom he himself has caused to be a certain way. In fact, if you attribute evil to God's predestination, you can't blame it on the human will. Therefore, either blame the crime on a person, and in this case you will avoid blaspheming God; or, if you claim that predestination is imposed by God on a sinner, you take away the crime of the sinner only to blame it on God. It is certain that sin is nothing else than a human being's transgression and that predestination is nothing other than God's providential arrangement. How could these people arrive at a conclusion that is so unusual and contrary to a unified explanation, as to turn the goodness of God into the evil of human beings and the foreordination of the One who prohibits evil into the vice of a sinner? Why don't you concede this, you who believe that people commit sins because of God's predestination? Obviously, the devil wants and desires that every sin be committed; consequently, you must believe that God has established his predestination to satisfy the devil's desire and to bring about the death of the human race. You must also believe that God wanted his predestination to be subjected to the devil's will, thus abandoning guilty human beings to his enemy, the devil, even before they had a chance to act, with great satisfaction of demons, I may add. It should be sufficient so far to have unmasked the blasphemy of this view. However, feeling heavy with an anxious heart, I am shaking with an uncontrollable tremor. I have included eighty-nine heresies in the first book; I noticed that none of them has condoned human crimes as much as this last one, nor have I found another one that heaps up so many blasphemies on God. I must say that people who profess the Catholic faith join their ranks in defense of this blasphemy.

inquam, carissimi, uniuersa mei corporis membra torpescunt, animus deficit, auditus intremuit, facies pallore distabuit, capillorum seges in uertice riget, mens intus cum suis consiliis metu quassante afflita est, lingua ipsa in suo atrio moueri non praeuulet, quoniam contra eos loquimur, qui dicunt deum diaboli uoluntati seruire.

## 9. [IV]:

Iam enim, inquiunt, praedestinavit deus homines siue ad iustitiam siue ad peccatum, et idcirco quod eos uoluit esse qui condidit, aliud esse non possunt.

Cum interrogaueris eos, ut quid tantum blasphemiae proferant, dicunt quia dixit apostolus: *quos praedestinavit, hos uocauit.*

## 10. [V] Ideoque aiunt:

quos semel deus praedestinavit ad uitam, etiam si negligant, etiam si peccant, etiam si nolint, ad uitam perducentur inuiti. Quos autem praedestinavit ad mortem, etiam si currant, etiam si festinent, sine causa laborant.

Quis non uideat quod hoc dicto tollatur sollicitudo iustis timendi ne corruant, et peccatoribus amputetur effectus sperandi ne surgant? Euasimus blasphemias dei, ad ruinas hominum uenimus. Si enim ita est, ut unusquisque hoc sit quod praedestinatus est, cessat lex, cessat sacerdos, cessat deuotio populi, clauditur aula confugii, euacuatur sinus ecclesiae, nullus genu curuat deo, nullus benedictionibus inclinat caput. Clauduntur apices dei, atque uniuersa simul uirtutum studia euanescunt.

## 11. [VI]:

Quantumuis enim, aiunt, quicumque studeat, et a dei ecclesia et a dei sacerdotibus et a diuinis studiis non recedat, si semel eum deus praedestinavit ad mortem, saluus esse non poterit. Iudas quotidie uerbum uitae audiuit, quotidie adhaesit domino, quotidie uirtutibus occupatus, quotidie ipsum filium dei monitorem audiuit, et quia praedestinatus est ad mortem, uno ictu subito interiit. Saulus quotidie persecutor, quotidie lapidator Christianorum, quotidie uastator ecclesiarum, et quia praedestinatus est ad uitam, uno ictu subito uas electionis est factus. Quid ergo, inquiunt, tu qui in peccatis permanes, expauescis? Si te deus dignabitur, sanctus eris. Aut quid tu, qui in sanctitate uiues, sollicitus redderis? Si deus noluerit, numquam corrues. Vterque de deo securi estote. Numquid tu qui sanctus es, et sollicitus es ne corruas, et die noctuque

I appeal to the purity of your faith so that you may help me with your prayers as I fight on and react against people whose words are nothing but blasphemies. Beloved, all the members of my body are growing numb; my heart faints; my hearing weakens; my face grows pale; my hair stand up on top; my mind is afflicted with paralyzing fear in its deliberations; my tongue cannot move in my mouth. I beseech you, let us speak up against those who say that God wants to subject himself to the devil's will!

9. They say:

God has predestined people either to justice or to sin ... Therefore, since he who made people wanted them to be a certain way, they cannot be otherwise.

When you ask them how they can utter such a blasphemy, they say that they believe this because of the apostle, who says: *Those he predestined he also called.*<sup>68</sup>

10. Thus, they say:

Thus, we believe in our hearts that those whom God once predestined to life, even if they become negligent, or sin, or refuse to come along, are led to eternal life against their wishes. Conversely, we also believe that those whom God predestined to death, even if they run or hasten, they work in vain.

Who doesn't see that with this saying, people's zeal, stemming from the righteous fear to perish, is thereby removed and that the strength of hoping that one day they too may awake from their slumber is taken away from sinners? We have escaped the blasphemies against God, only to arrive at the final destruction of human beings. If this is how it is, namely that everyone is the way they are because they have been predestined, then the Law, the priest and people's devotion are rendered ineffective; the area of refuge is shut off; the bosom of the church is emptied; no one bends the knee to God; no one bows the head to blessings; the peaks of God are barred, and the practice of various virtues disappears.

11. They say:

Judas heard every day the word of life; everyday he was close to the Lord; everyday he practiced virtues; everyday he heard the Son of God give advice. However, because Judas was predestined to death, he died with one sudden move. On the contrary, every day Saul acted as a persecutor, a stoner of Christians, laying waste to the churches. However, because he was predestined to life, with one sudden move he was made a vessel of election. Therefore, why do you, who dwell in sin, become frightened? If God considered you worthy, you will be holy. Conversely, why is it that you, who live in holiness, remain zealous as if your zeal had the power to save you? Unless God wanted otherwise, neither one of you will perish. Both of you must have confidence in God! Do you, who are holy and try hard not to perish, who offer prayers day and night, who engage in fasting, who diligently

---

68 Rom 8:30.

orationibus ades, occuparis ieuniis, et diuinis lectionibus diligenter insistis, exhortationibus uacas atque omnibus sanctis studiis quotidie immines, numquid tua uoluntate saluus eris? Numquid sanctior eris Iuda, qui accepit in potestate infirmos curandi, daemonia fugandi, mortuos suscitandi, calcandi super serpentes et scorpiones, collega apostolorum, Christi discipulus, et tamen, quia praedestinatus est ad mortem, mortem aeternam inuenit? Cessa esse sollicitus, et de dei esto uoluntate securus, quoniam si te dignatur deus ut permaneas, sanctus eris. Aut tu qui peccator es, disce a Paulo apostolo. Numquid tu aliquando peiora poteris committere quam ille commisit? Et tamen, quia praedestinatus est ad apostolatum, euasit subito uniuersa peccata, et ab inferioribus inferis ad superna superiorum ascendit.

Hic est omnis summa consilii uestri, hinc decipitis mundum, hinc penetratis domos, et captiuatis mulierculas oneratas peccatis, quae circumducuntur uarii desiderii, semper discentes, et numquam ad scientiam dei peruenientes. Iuuante domino spiritus ille qui falsorum senum aduersum Susannam agentium scindit consilia, hic spiritus nunc uos diuidet aduersum immaculatam dei ecclesiam falsa tractantes. Et sicut illi de sua sibi accusatione inuenti sunt pleni fallaciis, ita uos ex uestris uobis oppositionibus abscedetis superati. Ipsa itaque uerba dicimus inter initia quae ipsi dixistis, sed aliter eorundem uerborum finem colligimus. Dicimus enim iusto: “certe Iudas apostolus fuit, et a Christi uestigiis non recessit, ex ore eius die noctuque consilia salutis accepit, signa uirtutum exercuit, et uniuersa obtinuit apostolatus insignia, et tamen quia negligens fuit, cecidit.” Vigila ne corruas, esto sollicitus, *quia aduersarius tuus, sicut leo rugiens, circuit quaerens ut transuoret.* Hoc autem quod cecidit Iudas, non putes fuisse impietatis dei, neque enim deus illum uoluit esse malignum, sed *quia fur erat, et loculos habebat*, et erat in corde eius *radix omnium malorum auaritia*, ideo corruit miser, et crepuit medius, qui tanta dona diuina neglexit, qui medico praesente uulnera sua non solum non curare, sed etiam augmentare studuit. In peccato enim Iudae uos ipsos iudices petimus. Ita enim uos iuuante Christo concludimus, ut uos ipsos ex uestro iudicio supereritis. In peccato Iudae grande est sacrilegium, incomparabile facinus, crimen immensum. Dicite nobis, cui uultis hoc crimen ascribi? Ipsi Iudae traditori, an deo praedestinatori? Si, quod dici peius peccatum est quam hoc quod Iudas exercuit, hoc peccatum dei praedestinatoris esse probaueritis, fateor uicistis. Si autem ipsius Iudae est traditoris, defensio nostra accepit palmam. Non enim deus illum uel

persevere in the divine reading, who do not need constant exhortations, and who everyday pursue all kinds of holy studies – do you really think that you will be saved because of your devotion? Would you be holier than Judas, who received the power to heal the sick, put demons to flight, raise the dead, walk over snakes and scorpions, who was a colleague of the apostles, and a disciple of Christ, and who, however, because he was predestined to death, incurred eternal damnation? O human being, cease to be zealous out of your own virtue and regard yourself safe thanks to God's will alone! In fact, you will not obtain anything good unless God wants you to; but if it will please God that you may persevere in goodness, you will be saved. You too, who are in sin, afraid and filled with a pointless despair, learn from the apostle Paul. Who can ever be found to equal his crimes? Could you possibly ever commit worse sins than he did? And yet, because he was predestined to be an apostle, he suddenly escaped [the eternal consequence of] all of his crimes and reached the highest highs from the lowest lows.

This is the essence of your beliefs; this is how you deceive the world, enter people's homes and win over foolish people burdened with sins, who are deceived with various desires, *always trying to learn but never able to reach a knowledge of the truth*.<sup>69</sup> Thus, with the help of the Lord, that spirit which thwarted the plans of the lying old men who conspired acting against Susannah now possesses you, as you speak false things against the immaculate Church of God. And just as those old men's accusations turned out to be filled with inaccuracies, likewise you walk away defeated by the objections you have raised against yourselves. Thus, we say the same things that you yourselves said at the beginning, though we reach a different conclusion. We say to a just person: "Judas was certainly an apostle and did follow in Jesus' footsteps. He constantly received from Jesus' mouth the precepts of salvation. He displayed the signs of virtues and received all the signs of the apostolic mission. However, because he became negligent, he fell away. *Be sober and vigilant. Your opponent the devil is prowling around like a roaring lion looking for someone to devour.*"<sup>70</sup> Do not think that Judas fell [from grace] due to God's impiety, for God did not want him to be evil. However, because he was a thief and the person in charge of the money box<sup>71</sup> and had in his heart *love of money, which is the root of all evil*,<sup>72</sup> he ruined himself and *burst asunder in the middle*,<sup>73</sup> having neglected so many divine gifts. Moreover, while he was in the presence of the divine physician, not only he neglected to cure his wounds but even strove to worsen them. We ask that you yourselves be the judges of Judas' sin. Thus, with the help of Christ we push you into a corner, so that you may be defeated by your own judgement. In Judas' sin lies a great sacrilege, an unprecedented misdeed, and an infinite crime. Tell us, to whom do you want to attribute this crime? To Judas himself, the traitor, or to God

<sup>69</sup> 2 Tim 3:7.

<sup>70</sup> 1 Pt 5:8.

<sup>71</sup> Jn 12:6.

<sup>72</sup> 1 Tim 6:10.

<sup>73</sup> Ac 1:18.

praedestinavit uel talem esse uoluit. Defendamus ergo sanctum et immaculatum a crimine dominum, ne quem ille tradidit per auaritiam, nos per iniustitiam accusemus, et tollentes crimen Iudei, dominum uocemus in culpam. Si enim ideo talis exstitit, quia talem illum deus praedestinavit, non quia ipse neglexit, ipsum quidem liberamus ab omni pondere criminis, et tollentes nos ab increpatione traditoris hominis, praedestinatoris dei astutiam accusamus, qui quasi uoluerit apostolum fieri ut eum ex apostolo faceret traditorem, quem quasi uoluerit eleuare ad caelos ut eum ex alto iactaret, quem quasi uoluerit daemonia eicere ut eum daemonum traderet potestati. Quid moras innectimus? Ante oculos uestros utrosque habetis, o nostri temporis tractatores, seruum et dominum, magistrum et discipulum, deum bonum et hominem malum, unum accusate quem uultis et unum laudate quem uultis. Si deum praedestinantem, Iudas immunis est, si Iudam tradentem, crimen eius deum praedestinasse docere minime potueritis, quia dei praedestinatio bona est, Iudei autem traditio mala. Bonus ergo rem bonam fecit, quia malum numquam fecisse credendus est. Et si praedestinatio dei bona est, et Iudei traditio pessima, rei malae Iudei et rei bonae dei conuenire non potuit. Impossibile est enim tenebris et lumini, bono et malo, uitae et morti, ueritati et mendacio simul habere consortium. Reddentes ergo Iudei soli peccatum suum ex integro, et deo honorem aequitatis suae integerrimum exhibentes, nobis quoque reddite osculum caritatis. Laboratis enim uano certamine, qui per Iudam omnes peccatores excusatis atque defenditis, dei autem iustitiam accusatis.

Nunc ueniamus ad magistrum bonum et uere beatissimum Paulum, et amota tergiuersationis insania, quod uerum et integrum negari non potest, explicemus. Aliud est zelo malitiae persecuti aliquem innocentem, sicut fecit Cain, aliud est zelo dei persecuti, sicut fecit Elias, nec solum persecutus est, sed etiam in conspectu suo multum populum gladio iussit occidi. Cain unum occidit, et aeterna damnatione punitur; Elias multos occidit, et ad gloriam rapitur sempiternam. Non ergo, sicut uos putatis, Cain imitatus est Paulus, sed zelo dei ductus Eliam secutus est. Dicas forsitan: unde hoc probas? Lege ad Galatas eundem sibi testimonium perhibentem atque dicentem: *persequeretur, inquit, ecclesiam dei, et expugnabat illam super multos coactaneos meos in genere meo, abundantius, inquit, aemulator existens paternarum mearum traditionum.* Numquid non omnibus catholicis notum est deum Hebraeorum hunc esse patrem domini nostri Iesu Christi? Quem ergo defendebat? Patrem sine dubio, quia sacerdotes sui ei dixerant hunc non esse filium dei quem crucifixerant. Credens itaque legi suae, credens sacerdotibus dei uiui, accepit ab eis epistolas, ut

the predestinator? If you determine that this sin is due to the predestining God, since I said that this sin is worse than that which Judas committed, I must concede that you have won the case. But if you conclude that this sin is due to Judas the traitor, our defense will win the case: for God neither predestined nor wanted him to be such a traitor. Therefore, we defend the Lord as holy and blameless from the charge of a crime. Conversely, by taking away the guilt from Judas, we end up blaming God. If he turned out to be a traitor because this is what God predestined him to be, and not because he himself was negligent, we absolve him from any responsibility for the crime. By not reproaching the traitor, we must blame the cunning of a predestining God, who acted as if he wanted to make an apostle out of Judas only to turn him from apostle into traitor; as if he wanted to raise him to heaven only to cast him from high to low; as if he wanted him to cast out demons only to hand him over to their power. Why should we delay to make up our minds? O writers of our time, you have before your eyes both the servant and the Master, the Teacher and the disciple, a good God and an evil man: blame whom you wish. If you blame the predestining God, Judas is innocent; if you blame the traitor Judas, you have very little reason to teach that God predestined him because God's predestination is good, but Judas' betrayal is evil. We must assume that a good God does what is good, since he has never done anything evil. And if God's predestination is a good thing, and Judas' betrayal is a very evil deed, it is not possible to reconcile Judas' evil deed with God's good action. For it is impossible to make light and darkness, good and evil, life and death, truth and falsehood go together at the same time. By attributing to Judas alone his sin in its entirety, and by paying respectful homage to God's justice you also re-establish communion with us. However, you toil in a pointless struggle when you excuse and defend all sinners like in Judas' case, but blame God's justice instead.

But now let us come to our good and most blessed teacher Paul and let us explain the most senseless and extreme aspects of your view, for it is not possible to deny what is true and wholesome. It is one thing to persecute an innocent person, being animated by a zeal for malice as Cain did, and quite another to persecute a person being animated by a zeal for God the way Elijah did. The latter not only persecuted, but also ordered many people to be killed in his presence by the sword. Cain killed one person and was punished with eternal damnation; Elijah killed many people and was snatched away, heading for eternal glory. Thus, it is not as you think, namely that Paul imitated Cain. Rather, Paul, being led by the Spirit of God followed Elijah's example. If by chance you were to ask: "With what texts do you prove this?" we would ask you to read Paul's own testimony to the Galatians about himself, where he says: *I persecuted the church of God beyond measure and tried to destroy it, and progressed in Judaism beyond many of my contemporaries among my race, since I was even more a zealot for my ancestral traditions.*<sup>74</sup> Doesn't every Catholic know that the God of the Jews is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? Which God did Paul defend? The Father, no doubt, because his priests had told him that this Jesus, whom they crucified, was not the Son of God. Believing in his Law and trusting the priests of the living God,

---

74 Gal 1:13,14.

pergens Damascum ad synagogas uinctos adduceret Christianos. Prudentissimus uir atque sapientissimus qui sciebat se zelo dei agere, sine dubio uidebatur ei quod inimicos dei persequeretur. Pro fide enim dei et pro ueritate currebat. Non enim filium dei esse dominum nostrum Iesum Christum didicerat, sed seductorem et deceptorem populi sui a magistris suis et a sacerdotibus suis ut audierat, aestimabat. Animum itaque Eliae, non Cain habens, erga nouos cultores dei fortiter insistebat, et ignorans crima pro uirtutibus exercebat. Deus autem, cordis inspector et fidei contemplator, fecit eum misericordiam inuenire, quia ignorantiam eius innocentia comprobabat. Vnde hoc probamus? Ipse dicit ad Timotheum: *fui, inquit, persecutor et iniuriosus, sed misericordiam consecutus sum, quia ignorans feci.* Vides ergo quia ubi ignorantia est, inuidia non est. A iustitia enim dei ignorantia doctrina traditur, scienti uero et contemnenti dictatur sententia. Vnde per obscurum ignorantiae ambulans Paulus putabat se inimicum domini sui persequi. Ardebat in persecutione, quia placere domino bonus famulus studebat. Non quiescebat, furebat, abundantius omnibus zelator existsens paternarum traditionum. Quorum patrum gerens zelum? Sine dubio Abrahae et Isaac et Iacob. Et qui horum deus? Sine dubio pater domini nostri Iesu Christi. Ergo huic placere studens putabat se eius insequi inimicum, passus obscuritatem sacerdotum suorum, quibus legis diuinae imperio fidem suam testimonium dantibus exhibebat.

Omnibus notum est quid habeat obscuritas. Numquid non ipse usus nos poterit edocere obscuritatis hanc esse naturam ut notum et ignotum, parentem et extraneum, ciuem et barbarum, uno modo ante oculos afferat, qui nisi locutus fuerit, quis ille sit penitus sciri non poterit? Hic ergo uelut bonus custos uineae domini Sabaoth domus Israel, uelut bonus circitor apprenenso baculo per noctem ignorantiae circuibat ut, quoscumque inueniret legentes uindemiam domini, Eliae animo deuastaret. Seruo itaque bono pro domini sui uinea uigilanti, seruo zelo fidei persequenti, seruo Eliam imitanti, seruo in tenebris ignorantiae pro ueritate certanti, seruo cui se sciebat dixisse ut pro ueritate certaret usque ad mortem, laboranti ergo et in obscuro fidei persequenti, et nescienti quod ipse esset dominus suus quem putabat inimicum domini sui, succurrit dicens: “quiesce, ego sum dominus tuus.” Modo tu ipse iudica de te ipso. Si introieris in uineam tuam nocte, numquid homo tuus aut seruus tuus in obscuro noctis dum te senserit, et cooperit uenire ut te comprehendat, dic mihi obsecro, ueritatem profer ex ore tuo, dic mihi, numquid taces, et permittis te teneri ab eo, quem probas quia non zelo, non inimicitiis facientibus te persequitur, sed te defendens, dum te aestimat furem, te ipsum pro te ipso

he received from them some letters, so that by travelling to Damascus he could take bound Christians back to the synagogues.<sup>75</sup> Since he was a very prudent and wise man, who knew he was motivated by zeal for God, it was obvious to him that he was persecuting God's enemies. He ran around for the sake of faith in God and for the sake of truth. He had not learned from his teachers and priests (whom he listened to and respected) that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of God, but rather that the latter was a seducer and a deceiver of his people. Having Elijah's rather than Cain's mindset, Paul turned his attention against the new worshippers of God, and not being aware of his crime he strove to practice virtue. But God, who knows the hearts and who looks at people's faith, caused him to find mercy since Paul's ignorance proved his innocence. How can we prove this? Paul himself told Timothy: *I was once a blasphemer and a persecutor and an arrogant man, but I have been mercifully treated because I acted out of ignorance in my unbelief.*<sup>76</sup> Can you see that where there is ignorance there is no real hatred? Hence Paul, walking in the darkness of ignorance, really believed that he was persecuting the enemy of his Lord; he was zealous in the persecution because, being a good servant, he tried to please the Lord. He did not rest but was enraged as he followed the tradition of the ancients more strictly than others. Whose ancients' zeal did he emulate? Without a doubt, Abraham's, Isaac's and Jacob's zeal. Who was their God? Without a doubt, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. And so, trying to please God, Paul honestly believed he was chasing after God's enemies. Having inherited the clouded judgement of his priests, he showed his faith to those who gave witness to the commands of the divine Law.

Everybody knows that his judgement was clouded. Isn't experience able to teach us that this is the very nature of darkness, namely that one perceives in the same way a relative or a stranger, a citizen or a barbarian, a familiar or an unfamiliar person? Unless the person speaks, how can one really tell the difference? Thus, Paul, like a good guardian of the Lord's house, namely Israel, or like a good watchman who grabs a stick, walked around in the night of ignorance in order to catch those who steal the Lord's "grapes" and to beat them up, being animated by the spirit of Elijah. But the Lord came to rescue of his good servant, who was minding the Lord's vineyard; a servant seeking faith and imitating Elijah, a servant seeking the truth in the darkness of ignorance, whom God knew he had instructed to fight to the death for truth. To his servant, who worked hard and who sought faith in the dark, not knowing that Jesus was his own Lord, whom Paul instead regarded as an enemy of God the Father, the Lord said: "Be still, I am your Lord." Now judge for yourself. If you were to enter your vineyard at night, are you telling me that if your guard or your servant, as he notices you in the darkness of the night and as he begins to move towards you to grab you (I beg you, be honest), you would remain silent and allow yourself to be grabbed by him, who by so doing demonstrate that he is not coming after you because he doesn't like you, but, on the contrary, because he is defending your interest since he mistook you for a thief? Isn't he demonstrating that he is persecuting you out

---

<sup>75</sup> Acts 9:2.

<sup>76</sup> 1 Tim 1:13.

persequitur? Huic tali seruo et laus debetur et praemium. Denique cum dixeris ei consequenti te et uolenti percutere: “cessa, ego sum dominus tuus,” statim abiecto fuste de manu sua, prosternens se pedibus tuis ueniam postulat ignorantiae, atque ex illa hora faciet quod ei paeceperis. Ita ergo tunc beatus Paulus, missus a sacerdotibus dei, iam meritis apostolicis plenus, uas electionis erat, habens intra se spiritum Eliae, persequebatur, ut ei uidebatur, inimicos legis dei, et quem putabat esse furem uineae domini sui ipse erat deus suus. Patiebatur enim noctem, cuius ei obscurum fecerat incredulitas sacerdotum. Iustus uero dominus in hac ipsa sibi persecutione, quam ipse patiebatur pro sua iustitia, complacebat quia ipse dederat legem quam ille seruabat. Non ergo quasi personarum acceptor apprehendit nolentem et fecit uolentem, apprehendit infidelem et fecit fidelem, apprehendit inimicum et fecit amicum, apprehendit malum et fecit bonum, sed suum fidelem et pro se laborantem alloquitur et dicit: *quid me persequeris?* At ille ipsa uerba quae solent in obscuro dici, ait: *quis es, domine?*, et dominus: *ego sum Iesus Nazarenus quem tu persequeris.* Statim credit, statimque transfert se a synagoga ad ecclesiam, non mutando dominum, sed ipsum esse quem semper coluit agnoscendo. Non ab alio deo ad alterum deum ueniendo, sed eundem esse deum quem semper coluerat comprobando. Non ab infidelitate ad fidem ueniendo, sed ipsam fidem quam iure habuerat possidendo. Iustus ergo dominus seruum suum cognouit, secundum quod ipse apostolus ad Timotheum dicit: *cognoscit dominus qui sunt eius.* His autem quos uidet non ueritatis defensione, sed uanae gloriae, et cupiditate aliqua eius se seruos esse iactantes, clamat eis dicens: *discede a me, quia non noui uos.*

Verum quid stamus in hoc loco, cum non solas has iniurias apostolo irrogetis ut dicatis eum inuitum tractum, cum ad unam uocem legatis eum de se dicentem: *si nolens hoc ago, dispensatio mihi credita est, si autem uolens hoc ago, mercedem accipio?* Excludite eum a mercede sua, et dicite: “quia nolens hoc agis inuitus tentus, inuitus es tractus: non tu curris, neque enim de cursu tuo proficis. Esto iam securus. Scias te, etiam si uolueris, peccare non posse.” Ad haec uobis ipse respondet: *ego sic curro, non quasi in incertum. Ego quotidie festino, et ad brauium supernae uocationis extendor. Et licet nihil mihi conscius sim, sed tamen non in hoc iustificatus sum. Nolite errare: deus non irridetur.* Ego enim, nisi in ieuniis multis institero et macerauero carnem meam, et seruituti tradidero, *ipse reprobus efficiar.* O magistrum bonum! O sapientem architectum et bonorum omnium instructorem! Sic fabricat ecclesiam, qui uult exemplum salutis offerre. Non resupinat animos in bono cursu satagentes ut putent se ita ad

of his love for you? Such a servant deserves praise and reward. Finally, having said to the one who is hunting you down and who wants to beat you up: “Stop it, I am your master!” – having thrown away the stick from his hand at once, and throwing himself at your feet, he will ask forgiveness for his ignorance. After all, at that time your servant was doing what you taught him to do. In the same way, blessed Paul, when he was sent by the priests of God, was already filled with apostolic merits and a vessel of election. Being possessed by the spirit of Elijah, he persecuted those whom he thought were the enemies of God’s Law. It turns out that he who Paul thought was a thief in God’s vineyard was none other than his own God. Paul was limited by the night, or by the darkness that was induced in him by the incredulity of the priests. The righteous Lord, in this same persecution conducted against himself, which he endured thanks to his justice, gave his approval because he himself had given that Law which Paul obeyed. It is not because he was a respecter of person that he grabbed the unwilling apostle and made him willing; grabbed him while he was unfaithful and made him faithful; grabbed him while he was an enemy and turned him into a friend; grabbed an evil man and turned him into a good man. Rather, he spoke to his faithful servant, who was working for him, saying: *Why are you persecuting me?*<sup>77</sup> But as Paul spoke the words that one usually asks in the dark: *Who are you, Sir?* the Lord replied: *I am Jesus whom you are persecuting.*<sup>78</sup> Immediately, Paul believed and went over to the church from the synagogue, not by switching Lords, since he whom he always worshipped anonymously is the same God; not by changing allegiance from one God to another, but by acknowledging that the God whom he always worshipped is the same one; not by changing from unfaithfulness to faith, but by possessing the same faith which he rightly had. The righteous Lord knew his servant according to what the apostle himself said in his letter to Timothy: *The Lord knows those who are his.*<sup>79</sup> To those whom God did not see engaged in defense of the truth but in defense of vain glory and in some yearning or another, though they bragged to be his servants, God said in a clear way: *I never knew you. Depart from me.*<sup>80</sup>

We have now reached the point where not only you cast these insults on the apostle, saying that he was drawn to God against his own will, but also where you ignore what he says about himself: *If I do so willingly, I have a recompense, but if unwillingly, then I have been entrusted with a stewardship.*<sup>81</sup> Exclude him from his reward and say: “Because you do this, being kept and drawn against your will, it is not you who fret; nor do you really profit from your effort, be certain of it! Know that you cannot sin, even if you wanted to.” Paul would answer you with these words: *I do not run aimlessly;*<sup>82</sup> *I continue my pursuit toward the goal, the prize of God’s upward calling, in Christ Jesus;*<sup>83</sup> *I am not conscious of anything against me, but I do not thereby stand*

<sup>77</sup> Ac 9:4.

<sup>78</sup> Ac 9:5.

<sup>79</sup> 2 Tim 2:19.

<sup>80</sup> Mt 7:23.

<sup>81</sup> 1 Cor 9:17.

<sup>82</sup> 1 Cor 9:26.

<sup>83</sup> Phil 3:14.

deum peruenire, ut ab animis suis tollant studium placendi deo, et dicant: “non ei placebimus de nostro studio. Quid studemus? Non ei placebimus de nostro cursu. Quid currimus? Non ei placebimus de nostra uoluntate. Quid uolumus? Non ei placebimus de nostra uigilantia. Quid uigilamus? Non ei placebimus de nostra oratione. Quid oramus? Si praedestinati sumus ad uitam, reprobri non erimus.” Hoc excludens Petrus apostolus clamat: *uigilate, quia aduersarius uester sicut leo rugiens circuit aliquem uestrum transuorare festinans*. Et apostolus Paulus: *nolite consentire operibus infructuosis tenebrarum, magis autem et redarguite. Nolite, inquit, consentire*. Vides consensum nostrum quam caute informat? Scit enim per consensum nostrum unumquemque decipi, unumquemque saluari. Consensum autem dico in quo consentimus medico, qui nos gratis curare uolens clamat ad nos quotidie: *uenite ad me, omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego uos requiescere faciam*. Ideo audis uocantem, ut te exhibeas respondentem. Hic qui clamat ut omnes ad eum ueniant, ignorauit doctrinam uestram. Nam non diceret: *uenite ad me omnes*, sed diceret: “ueniant ad me qui sunt praedestinati ad salutem, ut saluentur, recedant a me qui sunt praedestinati ad mortem, ut puniantur.” Sed non ita est, ut ipsi docetis. Homo enim, si consensum suum a uocatione dei subtraxerit, perit. Medicus hic noster gratis quidem curat, sed imperat obseruantiam. Qui non fuerit saluatus, aut uocantem contempsit aut inuitantem renuit aut ab his quae ei abstinere sunt mandata neglexit. Hoc nos dicimus de medico perfecto. Vos quid dicitis? Dicite quod uultis: si laudatis medicum, et culpatis aegrotum, ostenditis medici diligentiam et negligentiam aegrotantis.

12. [VII]. Non hoc dicitis, sed hoc dicitis quod habetis in fallacie uestrae libello conscriptum:  
 omnes quos scit dignos salute redemptionis suae deus, hos ad salutem praedestinavit. Hos tantum saluat quos se ad salutem praedestinasse cognoscit. Salus enim dei non uoluntati hominis seruit. Ipse enim scit cui quid faciat. Nec enim antecedit arbitrii libertas gratiam dei, sed antecedit gratia dei libertatem arbitrii.

acquitted;<sup>84</sup> Make no mistake: God is not mocked;<sup>85</sup> I drive my body and train it, for fear that, after having preached to others, I myself should be disqualified.<sup>86</sup> O good teacher! O wise architect and good instructor of all people! This is how God, who wanted to offer the example of salvation, builds his Church! He does not knock down the souls who toil on a good course, so as not to discourage those who think that they can reach him in this way, and so that they may remove from their hearts the zeal to please God, saying: “Why bother being zealous, if we will not be liked by God because of our zeal? Why do we fret, if God will not be pleased by our running, will, vigilance or prayers? If we are predestined to life, we will not be cast away.” But the apostle Peter, excluding this view, says: *Your opponent the devil is prowling around like a roaring lion looking for [someone] to devour*,<sup>87</sup> and the apostle Paul says: *Take no part in the fruitless works of darkness; rather expose them.*<sup>88</sup> He said: *Take no part.* Do you see that our consent cautiously informs it? As everybody knows, people are either saved or deceived through their consent. I am talking about the consent in which we agree with the physician who wishes to cure us free of charge, and who tells us every day: *Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will give you rest.*<sup>89</sup> Thus, listen to him who calls so that you may be reckoned as one who answers. This Jesus who calls, so that everyone may come to him, ignored your doctrine. For Jesus says: *Come to me all*, and not: “Let those who are predestined to salvation come to me, that they may be saved, and let those who are predestined to death depart from me, that they may be punished.” But things are not the way you teach. For if a person withdraws their assent from God’s call, they will die. Our physician cures people for free but requires the patient’s obedience. There will be no salvation for one who either despised God who called him, or turned down the God who invited him, or failed to abstain from those things he/she was ordered to keep away from. This is what we say about the perfect physician. What do you say instead? Say what you will: if you praise the physician and blame the patient, you still show the physician’s diligence and the patient’s negligence.

12. You do not say this, but rather, as you have written in the little book upholding your error:

All those whom God knows are worthy of the salvation issuing from his redemption, he predestined to salvation; thus, God saves only those whom he knew he had predestined to salvation. Salvation depends on God’s will, not on any given person’s; for God knows to whom this salvation applies. Nor does the freedom of human choice precede the grace of God, but rather the other way around: the grace of God precedes the will of human choice.

---

84 1 Cor 4:4.

85 Gal 6:7.

86 1 Cor 9:27.

87 1 Pt 5:8.

88 Eph 5:11.

89 Mt 11:28.

Haec uestra scripta sunt, uestra sunt dicta, ueris falsa permixta. Respondemus ad singula. Si omnes quos scit dignos uocat, ergo omnes ad salutem praedestinavit, quia omnes quotidie uocare non cessat. Si hos tantum saluat quos se praedestinasse cognoscit, ergo omnes praedestinavit ad salutem, quia omnium dominus et saluator est. Si salus dei non uoluntati hominis obtemperat, sed anticipat gratia dei uoluntatem hominis, ostendite nobis quis nolens consecutus sit baptismatis sacrosancta mysteria, et postea coepit per gratiam uelle quod noluit. Aut quis umquam nolens egerit paenitentiam, et postea quam reconciliatus est, sic coepit post indulgentiam paeniteri. Duae istae res sunt salutis humanae: sacrificium et confessio, sed et uoluntarie sacrificamus deo, et uoluntarie confitemur: sacrificium, quo sanguine Christi redimimur et lateris eius unda perfundimur, confessio uero, quia confitentes errorem, iterum meremur ueniam peccatorum. Ergo duas istas species, quas solas scimus humano generi posse succurrere, quas dicit sanctus spiritus uoluntarie fieri, uideamus utrum, ut uos dicitis, ab homine exigantur inuitu a uoluntario flagitentur obsequio. Si ab inuitu et a nolente, damus uobis manus, uicistis, si a consentiente et a desiderante atque uolente, consensus ueritatis dedit nobis uictoram per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum. Voluntarie enim sacrificamus deo, et confitemur nomini eius, quoniam bonum est.

## 13. [VIII]:

Non ita est, inquiunt. Vana est et infructuosa uoluntas hominis, uanum est humanae uoluntatis arbitrium.

Si ad comparationem diuinae gratiae hoc diceretis, unum diceremus. Non enim humanam uoluntatem diuinae gratiae praeponimus. Omnia enim quae bona sunt, non homini superbient, sed deo ascribimus miserenti. Non tamen haec dicentes, hoc possumus dicere quod uos et dicitis et scribitis: “uana uoluntas est hominis.” Nos autem dicimus: “uoluntas hominis non est uana, quia si uana est, nec praemium consequetur digna, nec supplicium meretur indigna.” Sed ne tam hebetes sitis ut *<ne>* negligendo nec audiendo ista quae asserimus cognoscatis, ite cum catechumenis et cum paenitentibus uestris ad omnium ecclesiarum pontifices, et si uideritis eos nolentibus gratiam baptismatis tradere, aut nolentibus paenitentiae imponere manum, sciatis uos esse catholicos. Sin uero nec baptismatis gratiam ausi sunt tradere, nisi ueram et integrum explorauerint uoluntatem, nec manum imponere paenitenti, nisi confessionem uoluntariam ostendent, quid insaniae uestrae uanitate attracti dicitis hoc loco: “antecedit gratia uoluntatem?” Maior quidem

This is what you are writing and saying, as you mix together true and false ideas. We are going to reply to each one of them in order. If God calls all those whom he knows are worthy, then he must have predestined everyone to salvation since he does not cease to call everybody, every day. If he only saves those whom he knew he predestined, then it follows that he predestined everybody to salvation because he is the Lord and Savior of all. If God's salvation does not depend on a person's will, and if the grace of God precedes the will of human beings, then show us the case of someone who receives the most sacred mysteries of baptism against their will and who afterwards begin to want, thanks to God's grace, what they did not care for, prior to that point. Or else, show us the case of someone who, though they never wanted to, made penance and later on were reconciled. The offer of human salvation and its confession are two separate things. We sacrifice to God and make a confession spontaneously. One thing is sacrifice, with which we are redeemed by Christ's blood and are covered with the flow of blood gushing from his side; another thing is true confession, with which, by confessing the error of our ways, we deserve again the forgiveness of sins. Therefore, let us see if these things, which the Holy Spirit declares to happen spontaneously and which we know are the only ones that can come to the rescue of humankind, are expected from people against their own will or whether they are solicited from an act of voluntary submission. If they are required from people against their wishes and unwillingly, we congratulate you, for you have proven your point. But if they are required from a consenting, yearning and willing person, the evidence has granted us victory through Jesus Christ our Lord. For we sacrifice to God and freely confess his name because he is good.<sup>90</sup>

13. “Not so,” they say:

For the human will is vain and of no avail, just like the choices stemming from the human will.

If you say this in reference to divine grace, then we are saying the same thing. For we do not put the human will before divine grace; since we attribute everything that is good not to prideful human beings, but to a merciful God. However, we cannot agree with what you say and write here: “The will of human beings is vain.” On the contrary, we say that their will is not vain, because if that was the case it would neither obtain a reward, if worthy, nor deserve a punishment, if unworthy. But so that you may not be foolish and ignore what we say, because either you purposely neglect it or fail to pay heed to it, go with your catechumens and your penitents to the priests of any church. If you see them administer the grace of baptism to those who do not really want it or lay hands on those who do not want to do penance, then you will know that you are real Catholics. But if the priests really did not dare to bestow the grace of baptism unless they saw a true and wholesome will in a candidate, or if they did not dare to lay hands on a penitent unless that person willingly produced a sincere confession, why is it that, being misled by the insanity which is the direct outcome

---

90 Cf. Ps 53 (54),8.

est gratia dei quam uoluntas hominis, sed prior est uoluntas hoc loco quam gratia. Illa merito praecedit, haec ordine. Scio hoc loco quas nebulas soleatis ignorantibus excitare, et calumniosos calliditatis ingenio in hac uoce garrire: “ecce dicunt: prior est uoluntas quam gratia.” Nos in his duobus locis dicimus priorem uoluntatem quam gratiam, in baptismatis consecutione et in paenitentiae conuersione, ut non uestro consilio ducti homines incipient uti *excusandas excusationes in peccatis*. Dum unus dicit: “si uult deus, ueniet ad me indulgentia peccatorum, et si uoluerit me in numero gregis sui addere Christus, fiet,” huic dicimus: “nisi uolueris ex toto corde tuo credere, non ad te ueniet indulgentia, neque gratia haec, ut gregis diuini particeps fias.” Item in peccatis permanentibus si dicatur: *paenitentiam agite, appropinquat regnum dei*, hi cum dixerint: “si deus dignatur dare ueniam peccatis, in potestate eius est,” his dicimus: “nisi uolueritis ex toto corde uestro paenitentiam agere, ad uos dei indulgentia numquam attingit.” In his ergo duabus causis dicimus: “antecedit uoluntas hominis gratiam dei.”

Hanc ipsam rursus uoluntatem hominis dicimus quomodo antecedit gratia dei: quia non haberet hoc ipsum uelle, nisi unigenitus nobis de caelo ueniens omnibus officinam suae gratiae reserasset. Veniens enim pro omnibus hominibus passus est. Ergo hoc ordine praecedit gratia dei uoluntatem hominis. Quod ideo dicimus, ut duobus capitibus uos excludamus. Qui enim dicitis: “antecedit gratia uoluntatem,” bene sonatis, sed male percutitis. Ideo enim dicitis: “antecedit gratia uoluntatem,” ut homo nec incipiat uelle bonus, sed expectet ut trahatur, exspectet ut nolens fiat bonus, et cum sit malus, dicat: “deus hoc uult, quia gratia eius ad me non accedit.” Nos in isto loco et uobis et illi qui hoc dicit, occurrimus dicentes: “antecedit uoluntas hominis gratiam dei.” Non enim dixit dominus: “accipietis prius, et sic petite,” “inuenietis prius, et sic quaerite,” “aperietur uobis prius, et sic pulsate,” sed dixit: *petite et dabitur uobis, quaerite et inuenietis, pulsate et aperietur uobis. Omnis enim qui petit accipit*. Nota tibi: *omnis dicit, omnis enim qui petit accipit*. Dicendo *omnis*, generalem causam instituit, et praedestinationis tuae specialitatem exclusit. Et dicendo: *qui petit accipit*, priorem uoluntatem hominis, quam donum gratiae demonstrauit. Et tamen fit prior uoluntas hominis quam gratia, fit et prior dei gratia quam uoluntas. Non enim nos iuimus ad sanctum peccatores, sed ad peccatores sanctus aduenit, nec nos rogauimus ut ueniret, sed non rogatus aduenit, et ut ascenderet ad deum homo, deus descendit ad hominem. Exinaniuit se, ut nos repleret. Humiliauit se, ut nos exaltaret. Pauper factus est, ut nos diuites faceret. Esuriuit panis uiuus, ut nos reficeret.

of your vanity, you say in this passage: “Grace precedes the will?” The grace of God is greater than the human will, but the will, in this context, is prior to grace. Grace comes first in regard to merit; the human will comes first in regard to logical order. I know that on this matter you usually confuse the ideas of those who are ignorant and that you like to blabber in this fashion, playing a false and deceptive trick, when you say about us: “Here is what they say: ‘The will comes before grace.’” We say that the will precedes grace in these two cases: in the performance of baptism and in the conversion leading to penance. We say this, so that people, not being led astray by your suggestion, may really begin to incline their hearts to the things that need to be forgiven. To anyone who says: “If God wills it, the forgiveness of sins will come to me; and if Christ will be pleased to add me to the number of his sheep, it will be done,” we would like to reply: “Unless you want to believe with all your heart, neither forgiveness nor this grace will come to you, thus allowing you to join the ranks of the blessed.” If anything, let us say to those who remain in their sins: *Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand!*<sup>91</sup> Since some people have said: “If it pleases God to bestow forgiveness of sins, it is in his power to give it;” we reply: “Unless you are willing to repent from the depth of your heart, the forgiveness of God will never reach you.” Thus, in these two cases we say: “The human will precedes the grace of God.”

Let us repeat in what sense the grace of God precedes our human will, considering that the latter would not be endowed with the strength to will unless the only begotten Son, coming down to us from heaven, had not opened wide the gates of his grace. As he came on earth, he suffered for all people. Thus, in this sequence, the grace of God precedes the human will. This is what we say, in order to counter your charges on two counts. For when you say: “Grace precedes the will,” it sounds like you are right, but then you continue in the wrong direction. For you go on to say: “Grace precedes the will, so that a person may not begin to want what is good, but rather wait to be drawn to it, or wait to be made good from their state of unwillingness. And when a person is evil, they may rightly say: ‘God wills so, for his grace did not reach me.’” We argue against your interpretation, saying that the human will precedes the grace of God. In fact, the Lord did not say: “You will receive first, so go ahead and ask; you will find first, so then, go ahead and seek; it will be opened to you first, so then go ahead and knock.” On the contrary, the Lord said: *Ask and it will be given to you; seek and you will find; knock and the door will be opened to you. For everyone who asks, receives; and the one who seeks, finds; and to the one who knocks, the door will be opened.*<sup>92</sup> By saying “everyone” he established a general principle and excluded particularism from his predestination; and by saying *The one who asks receives* he established the priority of the human will rather than of the gift of grace. And yet, despite the fact that the human will rather than grace comes first, it is also true that God’s grace occurs before and indeed is superior to the will. It was not us sinners who first approached the Holy One; rather, it was the Holy One who came to us sinners. Nor did we pray that he would come; rather, he came uninvited. *In order that man may rise to God, God stooped*

---

<sup>91</sup> Mt 3:2; 4:17.

<sup>92</sup> Mt 7:7,8.

Situit fons perennis ut nos aridos melliflui et aeterni fontis unda perfunderet. Tentus est, ut nos dimitteremur. Ligatus est, ut nos solueremur. Venditus est, ut nos redimeret. Spineam coronam accepit in capite, ut spinas et tribulos primae maledictionis eriperet. Expoliatus est, ut nos uestiret. In cruce suspensus est, ut nos a cruciatibus aeternae mortis auferret. Damnans de ligno crucis lignum concupiscentiae, pandit immaculatas manus pro manibus incontinenter extensis. Pro concupiscentiae gustu esca fellis accipitur, et mors uitae pro uita mortis infertur. Nobis enim uicit, non sibi. Semper enim ipse uictoriosissimus fuit, est et futurus est. Sed quia nos omnes in Adam perdidimus uitam et paradisum, per Christum et paradisum et uitam aeternam et adoptionem filiorum dei et regnum consequimur sempiternum. Hoc loco eum qui dicit: “antecedit uoluntas hominis gratiam dei” exsecramur uehementer. Sic tamen execramur, ut dicamus iam ex tempore passionis et resurrectionis et in caelos ascensionis, quo iam gratia in mundo diffusa est, et in gremio ecclesiae haec dona omnia diuinae gratiae collocata, qui non cucurrit ad ista tanta dona dei, et ipse non uadens ad ecclesiam dei exspectet ut ad ipsum ueniat ecclesia dei, dicimus hunc insanum. In hoc loco dicimus his et talibus: gratia dei, absque personarum acceptione, in gremio est collocata ecclesiae. Si quis eam uoluerit quaerere, inuenit. Si quis ad eam pulsauerit, aperietur ei. Nolentibus autem aut tepide uolentibus gratia diuina non datur, secundum id quod Philippus apostolus dicit spadoni: *si credis ex toto corde tuo, licet ut baptizeris. Velle enim nostrum non exclusit gratia, sed incitauit, et dormientem quotidie excitat uoluntatem.*

Iam ergo gratia posita, sicut scriptum est, *in medio terrae* clamat: *uenite*: hic sermo dei anticipat uenientem. *Petite*: hic sermo dei anticipat petiturum. *Quaerite*: hic sermo anticipat inquisitorum. *Pulsate*: hic sermo anticipat pulsaturum. Si quaeasierit homo et inuenerit, gratiae dei est, quia deus inuitauit ut quaereres, deus fecit ut inuenires. Si non quaeasieris, nec inuenies. Hoc liberi arbitrii tui est. Tantam enim habes liberi arbitrii potestatem ut et uocantem dominum tuum contemnere praeualeres. Quicumque ergo saluatur, gratiae dei est, qui ut uelles instituit, qui et per prophetas et per se et per apostolos suos quotidie te inuitat ut uelis. Si uolueris et audieris, quae bona sunt terrae illius aeterna suscipes. Ergo et quod uis dei est, et quod potes dei est, et quod consequeris dei est, quia in hac parte anticipat gratia uoluntatem. Nescires enim quid uelis, nisi te ipse et per se et per suos uocaret, et ut peteres, et qualiter peteres, edoceret. Si ita est, quid nunc faciemus de te qui non potes? Deus te noluit, an tu noluisti deum? Deus te noluit bonum operari, an tu noluisti bonum operari? Deus te

*low to reach man. He emptied himself in order to fill us. He humbled himself in order to exalt us. He became poor in order to make us rich. The living bread was hungry in order to heal us. The perennial spring was thirsty, so as to flood us, who were dry, with the waters gushing forth from an eternal spring. He was a captive, so that we may be allowed to go free. He was bound, so that we may be saved. He was sold, in order to redeem us. He received a crown of thorns on his head, in order to pull out the thorns and weeds of the original curse. He was stripped, in order to clothe us. He was hung on a cross, in order to rescue us from the pangs of eternal damnation. Cursing from the wood of the cross the wood of concupiscence, he opened his blameless hands for the sake of our human hands filled with incontinence. He became bait of hatred for the taste of concupiscence. Thus, the death of life was exchanged for the life of death. He overcame all this for us, not for himself. But since in Adam all of us have lost life and heaven, we obtain eternal life, heaven, and the everlasting kingdom of God and the adoption of the children of God through Christ. In this sense we greatly deplore anyone who says: “The human will precedes God’s grace.” We deplore such a person, since we say that since the time of the Lord’s passion, resurrection and ascension into heaven, during which grace was spread into the world, all these gifts of divine grace were placed in the Church’s womb. We declare insane anyone who will not take refuge in such great gifts of God, and who, refusing to go to God’s church, waits for the church of God to go to them, instead. In this regard we say to such a person and to his likes: “The grace of God, without playing favorites, has been placed in the church’s womb. If anyone wants to find it, he will find it; if anyone will knock, it will be opened to him. But to those who resist this grace, or to those who want it only half-heartedly, divine grace is not given, just as the apostle Philip told the eunuch: *If you believe with all your heart, you may [be baptized.]*<sup>93</sup> Grace did not exclude our will but excited it and still excites it every day when it is asleep.”*

The grace placed on the earth, (g) exclaims: “Come.” This word of God precedes the one who comes. The word “ask,” anticipates the one who will ask. The word “seek” anticipates the one who will seek. The word “knock” anticipates the one who will knock. If a person will seek and find, it is thanks to God’s grace. Since God invited you in order that you may seek, he made it possible for you to find; if you are not going to seek you will not find either: this is up to your free will. You have such a great faculty of free will that you are even able to despise your Lord as he calls you. Therefore, whoever is saved owes it to God’s grace, who made it possible for you to will, and who, through himself, the prophets and his apostles invites you to will. If you are willing and if you listen, you will receive his eternal gifts that are on the earth. Therefore, what you want is God’s; what you ask is God’s; and what you obtain is God’s, because, in this regard, grace precedes the will. You would not know why you want unless God called you through himself and his people and taught you how to ask and what to ask for. Therefore, if this is how things are, what should we think about you who do not ask? Was it God who did not want you to do what is good, or did you refuse to do good? Was it God who did not want you, or was it you who did not want God? Was it God who did not want you to be just, or

---

<sup>93</sup> Ac 8:37.

noluit esse iustum, an tu noluisti esse iustus? Ideo te interrogo, o sanctissime praedestinator, ut unum e duobus facias. Aut enim fateberis te uinci, aut deum blasphemare conuinceris. Si enim permittis te uinci, dic nobis cum: “homo noluit bonum, et ideo malus est, quia si uoluerit petere dabitur ei gratia dei.” Cum hoc dixeris, das manus fraternitati, et per reuerentiam te deitati concilias. Si autem dixeris: “ideo malus est, quia hoc deus uoluit, non quia homo noluit,” probaris blasphemasse deum, quem malum uelle confirmas, et necesse erit ut blasphemantem deum anathematizet ecclesia.

14. [IX] Dicamus nunc quae sequuntur libri uestri falsa commenta:

errat qui se putat uolendo bonum peruenire ad Christum, cum ipse Christus dicat: *nemo uenit ad me, nisi quem pater attraxerit*. Qui melius a Christo sapitis, dicite si mentitus est Christus, et ita demum asserite nos contra Christi regulam istam fixisse sententiam. Si enim uerum dixit Christus, non mentimur quod dicimus praedestinatos trahi ad uitam, quia uita ipse est.

Non est nouum uocis sono decipi posse stultos. Sic uanus Arrius, secutus uocis sonum, dicit filio patrem eius esse maiorem. Et hoc dicit nobis quod dicitis uos: “si ipsi filio creditis, ipsum audite. Dicit enim: *quia pater maior me est*.” Voci sonum qui attendit, sicut Arrianorum haeresi, sic praedestinatorum uanitati coniungitur. Quis enim nesciat non posse uenire ad filium, *nisi quem pater attraxerit*? Tamen antequam loci istius occultum mysterium per nos dominus manifestet, sensum uestrum detegimus. Ideo enim dicitis hoc testimonium ut nullus monita sacerdotum studiosa aure suscipiat, nullus festinet ad matris ecclesiae gremium, et duorum testamentorum uberibus coalescat. Omnes fugiant domum dei, et quis ad quod uoluerit uitium occupetur, exspectans quando mittat manum pater de caelis ut eum trahat in uitum et nolentem atque contradicentem et non consentientem faciat electum et sanctum. Haec uestra assertio, uestrumque deprehenditur dogma. Nos autem dicimus quod quamuis quicunque sanctus sit, ille sit apostolus, ille sit martyr, ille sit propheta, ille sit iustus, uires non habet proprias ut ad Christum ascendat. Solus enim dominus sua uirtute pro sua deitate ascendit in caelos, et sedet ad dexteram patris. Quamuis ergo quisque sit sanctus, quamuis amicus dei sit, non habet uires ascendendi in caelos. Et quia filius dicit patri: *pater, uolo ut ubi sum, et isti sint mecum*, explanans concordiam deitatis ait: *nemo uenit ad me* – id est uirtute sua nemo potest uenire ad me; non est enim sanctitati

did you refuse to be just? And so, I ask you, o most holy supporter of predestination, to choose between these two options. Because either you are destined to be defeated, or you will prove that you are blaspheming God. For if you allow yourselves to be defeated, just tells us: “Human beings did not want what is good, and thus they are evil; for if they would have asked, the grace of God would have been given them.” If you admitted this, you may shake our hand and reconcile yourself to God through your reverence. But if you were to say: “A person is evil because God wanted him/her to be so, and not because he/she did not want to be good,” you will prove to have blasphemed God and confirm that God wanted him/her to be evil. In this case, it will be necessary for the Church to cast an anathema upon people like you, for blaspheming God.

14. Let us now discuss the false arguments found next in your book:

One who assumes that he/she can come to Christ through the good that he/she wants, since Christ himself says: *No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draw him*, is mistaken. Now, you who know better because of what Christ said, tell us whether Christ lied: in this case you may claim that we have reached our conclusion by going against this saying of Christ's. But if Christ told the truth, we are not lying when we say that those who are predestined are drawn to eternal life, since Jesus himself is eternal life.

There is nothing new in the fact that fools can be misled by the sound of words. Thus, that liar, Arius, following the sound of words, said that the Father is greater than his Son. And he said to us the same thing you are saying: “If you believe in the Son, listen to him, for Jesus said: *The Father is greater than I*.<sup>94</sup> Just like those people in the past who agreed with the Arian heresy, you too now, following the sound of words, are swayed by the vain predestinarian heresy. For, who doesn't know that one cannot come to the Son *unless the Father draws him*? However, before the Lord unmasks the hidden mystery of your book thank to us, we are going to refute your interpretation. You give this testimony, so that no one may listen to the solicitous admonishments of priests, or rush to the womb of the Church in order to grow strong and draw nourishment from the breasts of the two testaments; so that everyone may avoid the house of God, and be involved in the vice of their preference, as the Father waits to intervene from heaven, to draw an unwilling and recalcitrant person against their will and to elect and sanctify them, even though that person is not consenting. This is your claim and your dogma, as they are finally being exposed. On the contrary, we say that even though a person is holy, an apostle, a martyr, a prophet, or a just person – they do not have strength in themselves to rise to Christ. Only the Lord ascended to heaven and sits at the right hand of the Father thanks to his own virtue and for the sake of his own divine nature. Regardless whether a person is holy or a friend of God, they do not have the strength to lift themselves up to heaven. And because the Son told the Father: *I wish that where I am they also may be with me*,<sup>95</sup> as he explained the unity of God, he also said: *No one*

---

<sup>94</sup> Jn 14:28.

<sup>95</sup> Jn 17:24.

hominis possibile ascendendi ad me, ubi sedeo ad dexteram patris – *nisi quem pater attraxerit*. Vnde in unius persona omnis coetus sanctorum dicit deo: *tenuisti manum dexteram meam, in uoluntate tua deduxisti me, et cum gloria assumpsisti me*. Vnde et adiecit: *quoniam qui se longe faciunt a te, peribunt*. Non dixit: “quos tu longe facis a te,” sed *qui se longe faciunt a te, peribunt*, ostendens non de dei execratione, sed de elongatione hominis, homini interitum euenire.

15. [X] Quid autem nunc dicat liber Praedestinatus audite: quod si aggrauat uos uis testimonii euangelici, et non potestis aggrauati pondere sententiae nobis dare responsum, saltem apostoli nobis explanate sententiam, qui dicit: *non est uolentis neque currentis, sed miserentis est dei*.

Nos et euangelicum testimonium ueris assertionibus declarauimus, et istam beati Pauli sententiam eudenti manifestamus instinctu. Prius tamen uestrum sensum detegimus, ut cur a uobis usurpentur sancta testimonia detestemur. Vultis enim ut nemo uelit bonum, nemo currat ad bonum, sed dicat in corde suo: “quantumcumque uelim, quantumcumque curram, nihil poterit prodesse uolenti, nihil poterit prodesse currenti. *Non est enim uolentis neque currentis, sed miserentis est dei*.” Nos autem asserimus neminem gratiam dei consequi, nisi qui ex fide cucurrit, quam dum fuerit consecutus, apostoli monitis prohibetur extolli. Non enim secundum cursum suum et secundum uoluntatem suam accepit gratiam dei. Cursus enim et uoluntas eius, quamuis in magno sint, quamuis in ampio sint, tamen mensuram habent, dei autem gratia mensuram non habet. Et ideo, dum etiam ad coronam peruererit iustus, non permittitur in sua corona extolli. Dicit enim spiritus sanctus: *qui coronat te, non in merito tuo, sed in misericordia sua et miseratione sua*. Vnde et apostolus: *quid habes, inquit, quod non accepisti? Quod si accepisti, quid gloriaris, quasi non acceperis?* Ergo cursum suum et uoluntatem suam ad hoc extendit, ut acciperet a donante. Donum autem pro gratia donantis supergreditur meritum laborantis. Sic est enim uelle nostrum inter nos et deum, sicut est inter mendicantem atque donantem. Ille itaque qui donat eleemosynam, uult omnibus dare, si quidem hic noster largitor gratiae clamat quotidie: *uenite ad me, omnes*. Et iterum: *petite et accipietis*. Verbi gratia, cucurrit quispiam egenus, et a donante accepit, acceptisque diuitiis coepit esse locuples qui fuerat egenus et pauper. Quid nunc dicturus est? “Ego de labore meo diues sum, quia uolui, quia cucurri?” Non hoc dicit, sed dicit: “ego nihil pro merito uoluntatis meae aut cursus mei aliquid habere me certus sum,

comes to me, meaning: “No one comes to me because of their own virtue. It is not possible for a person to be lifted up to me through human holiness, where I sit at the right hand of the Father, *unless the Father draws him.*” Hence, the entire crowd of the saints said to God in one voice: *You take hold of my right hand. With your counsel you guide me, and at the end receive me with honor,*<sup>96</sup> and then added: *But those who are far from you perish.*<sup>97</sup> The text does not say: “Those whom you push away from you,” but *those who are far from you shall perish*, thereby showing that death does not come to people because of God’s curse, but rather because they distance themselves from God.

15. Listen to what the book *Praedestinatus* says now:

For if you, who react against our opinion, find that the strength of the evangelical witness is too much to bear, and being upset by it, cannot give us an answer, at least explain to us the saying of the Apostle: *So it depends not upon a person’s will or exertion, but upon God, who shows mercy.*<sup>98</sup>

We uphold the witness of the Gospel with true affirmations and correctly understand this sentence of blessed Paul. We expose your way of thinking before rejecting the reason why you misuse the testimony of Scriptures. As you have it, no one wants good, no one does good; rather, everybody says in their heart: “Regardless of how much I want, how much I run, nothing can help one who wants or runs. *It is not up to a person who wants or runs, but to God who has mercy.*” On the contrary, we claim that no one can attain God’s grace other than a person who has run because of their faith. Until someone has attained this grace, they are forbidden by the apostle’s warnings to be exalted, since they did not receive the grace of God thanks to their own will and effort. In fact, their will and effort, even though they were abundant, were nevertheless limited; conversely, God’s grace is boundless. This is why the just, though they will attain the crown, are not allowed to glory in it. The Holy Spirit says: *Who redeems your life from the pit and crowns you with mercy and compassion.*<sup>99</sup> Hence the apostle says: *What do you possess that you have not received? But if you have received it, why are you boasting as if you did not receive it?*<sup>100</sup> Thus, a person extended his effort and will to this, namely to receive from the one who gives: but the gift of the giver far exceeds the merit of the person who toils. Our willing, in relationship to God, is similar to the exchange between a beggar and a giver. He who gives alms wants to give to everybody, considering that God, the giver of grace, is able to say every day, *Come to me, all of you, and again, Ask and you will receive.* Thanks to the grace of the Word, any poor person exerted themselves and received from the giver; having accepted wealth, a person who once was poor and destitute now began to be rich. What should that person say now? “I am rich out of my own effort, because I willed

---

<sup>96</sup> Ps 72:23,24.

<sup>97</sup> Ps 73:27.

<sup>98</sup> Rom 9:16.

<sup>99</sup> Ps 103:4.

<sup>100</sup> 1 Cor 4:7.

sed eius est totum gratiae qui donauit.” Et hoc dicto potest dicere cum apostolo uere quia *non est uolentis neque currentis, sed miserentis est dei.*

Ecce diximus de isto qui uoluit et qui cucurrit, quia tanta sunt dona dei ut et cursum hominis et uoluntatem superent. Cursus enim et studium hominis, nisi inuisibilibus dei adminiculis iuuati fuerint, euanescunt. Nam et apostolus certamen bonum certans, et cursum consummans, et fidem seruans, et iam tantummodo coronam exspectans, dicit: *gratia dei sum id quod sum.* Et iterum nobis dicit: *gratia salui facti estis.* Magnus infelix est qui putat donum dei se merito suae consequi uoluntatis. Omne donum optimum desursum est a patre gloriae, nihil uindicamus humanae potentiae. Totum quidquid bonum est, dei misericordiae applicamus. Sic tamen omnia bona dicimus dei esse dona, ut omnia mala quae agimus nostrae negligentiae imputemus. Aliter enim ueniam non meremur, nisi nos uere ostendamus nostra culpa peccasse, non praeiudicio creatoris. Et sicut diximus de bono, quia totum bonum quod fecerit, dei est gratiae, ita quidquid malum fecerint suae aestiment negligentiae. Vnde clamat spiritus sanctus: *si uolueritis et audieritis me, bona terrae edetis. Si autem nolueritis, gladius uos comedet.* *Os enim domini locutum est haec.* Per occasionem itaque boni testimonii, sed mali interpretis, uos dicitis: “nolite uelle, quia non est uolentis”; sanctus spiritus dicit: “si uolueritis.” Vos dicitis: “nolite currere, quia non est currentis”; sanctus spiritus dicit: *sic currite ut omnes comprehendatis.* Dominus Iesus Christus clamat: *currite, cum lucem habetis, ne uos tenebrae comprehendant.* Dantes ergo uobis repudium, sancto spiritui adhaeremus. *Melius est enim, ut dicit apostolus Petrus, obaudire magis deo quam hominibus.*

16. [XI] Verum quid agimus? Rursus ad peiora uestrorum crescit dogma librorum, in quibus legitur: *quantumcumque studii sui uires ad aedificandum moueat humana uoluntas, casso certamine nititur. Aut quid uigilantiam suam putat hominis fragilitas aeternis desideriis profuturam, cum propheta euidentibus exclamet documentis dicens: nisi dominus aedificauerit domum, in uanum laborauerunt qui aedificant eam. Nisi dominus custodierit ciuitatem, in uanum uigilauerunt qui custodiunt eam?* Quid est quod contra diuinos apices et contra conscientiam suam sperat se quispiam aedificationi studere, cum his sacris uocibus doceatur aedificatio hominis non esse certa, sed uana?

so, because I toiled?" Such person doesn't say this, but rather: "I am certain that I don't have anything thanks to my own will and effort, but that everything comes from the grace of him who gave." Having said this, such person can truly say with the apostle: *So it depends not upon a person's will or exertion, but upon God, who shows mercy.*<sup>101</sup>

We talked about a person who willed and toiled because God's gifts are so many that they abundantly exceed human beings' effort and will. Human beings' effort and zeal fade away unless they are aided in an invisible way by God's support. The apostle, fighting the good fight and running the race, keeping the faith and already awaiting the crown,<sup>102</sup> said: *By the grace of God I am what I am,*<sup>103</sup> and again he told us, *By grace you have been saved.*<sup>104</sup> They are most wretched who believe the gift of God has been attained thanks to their will. All good giving and every perfect gift are from above, coming down from the Father of lights;<sup>105</sup> we do not claim anything for the human power, for we attribute everything that is good to God's mercy. We claim that all good things are God's gifts, in order to attribute all the bad things we do to our own negligence. Otherwise, we do not deserve forgiveness if we do not sincerely declare that we have sinned because of our fault and not because of the Creator's prejudice. And just as we said about goodness, namely that every good thing that is done is due to God's grace, likewise, every evil thing that is committed ought to be attributed to people's own negligence. Hence the Holy Spirit says: *If you are willing, and obey, you shall eat the good things of the land but if you refuse and resist, you shall be eaten by the sword: for the mouth of the Lord has spoken!*<sup>106</sup> By means of a good witness but of a bad interpretation, you say: "Do not want, because it is not up to the person who wants." The Holy Spirit said: "If you are willing." You say: "Do not fret, because it is not up to a person who frets." The Holy Spirit said: *Run so as to win.*<sup>107</sup> The Lord Jesus exclaims: *Walk while you have the light, so that darkness may not overcome you.*<sup>108</sup> By dissociating ourselves from you, we adhere to the Holy Spirit. As the apostle Peter says: *We must obey God rather than men.*<sup>109</sup>

16. What are we to do? The dogma of your books takes a turn for the worse. In it, we read:

Therefore, inasmuch as the human will inspires people to act according to its own thoughts, it fights a lost battle. Or why is it that human frailty thinks that its own vigilance will further God's desires, when the psalmist warns us with clear words: *"Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build. Unless the Lord guard*

<sup>101</sup> Rom 9:16.

<sup>102</sup> 2 Tim 4:7.

<sup>103</sup> 1 Cor 15:10.

<sup>104</sup> Eph 2:5-8.

<sup>105</sup> Jas 1:17.

<sup>106</sup> Is 1:19,20.

<sup>107</sup> 1 Cor 9:24.

<sup>108</sup> Jn 12:35.

<sup>109</sup> Ac 5:29.

Primo omnium quaero, quam aedificationem dicatis. Si de caementis et luto agitis, cum Aegyptiis ista tractate. Nos autem hoc loco aedificationem uerbi dei intelligimus. Verbum autem dei in toto orbe terrarum a dei sacerdotibus ad aedificationem dei ecclesiis exhibetur. Vanus est ergo sermo pontificis? Inanis doctrina? Inane studium? Et si uana est aedificatio huius operis, ut quid ab apostolo imperatur? Dicit enim Paulus apostolus: *aedificate alterutrum: omnia uestra ad aedificationem fiant. Et iterum: ut sapiens architectus fundamentum posui. Si quis superaedificat supra fundamentum hoc aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos, ligna, fenum, stipulam, uniuscuiusque opus quale sit ignis probabit.* Et dominus in euangelio laudat uirum sapientem quia aedificat domum suam super petram, quae nec uentorum nec fluminum deiciatur impulsu. Ergo ne in uanum aedificant sacerdotes ecclesiam, in uanum uigilant, ut ouium simplicitatem luporum morsibus tollant? Et quomodo omnes haereticos aeterno anathemate ferientes gregem Christi custodiunt? Vbiique catholicorum pascuntur oves, et uernantibus purae fidei pascuis, *montes exultant ut arietes et colles uelut agni ouium.* Vbiique a solis ortu usque ad occasum, unus grex et unus est pastor, a quo lupi interficiuntur ne noceant gregi dei, et adhuc non uidetis aedificationem bonae uoluntatis uanam non esse, sed certam? Quotidie aedificatur domus dei per uerbum bonum, per exemplum sanctum, per studium optimum. Quotidie clamat per prophetam dominus: *aedificate uobis domos*, non luteas quae a uento moueantur, sed quae maneant in soliditatem petrae. Sed uobis ista omnia quae diximus, inania uidentur et uana. Dicunt enim libri uestri: “aedificatio hominis non est certa, sed uana.” Ab initio omnes sancti aedificationem mentibus contulerunt. Verbi causa, primus Abel aedificauit iustitiam, Noe innocentiam, Abraham fidem, Isaac sacrificium, Iacob ambitionem rerum sanctarum, Ioseph castimoniam, Moyses sacerdotium, Iesus filius Naue constantiam animi, Dauid defensionem populi dei, Salomon sapientiam, Iohannes paenitentiam. Hos carptim de multis memorauimus ut per hos ceteros, quos siluimus, ad memoriam suam reuocans lector inquirat utrumnam homines fuerint. Si homines fuerunt, quomodo dicunt libri eorum: “aedificatio hominis non est certa, sed uana?” Vnde agimus nunc conclusionibus catholicis dictum haereticorum: aut non fuerunt homines, quia manet aedificatio eorum, aut illi homines fuerunt, et istorum assertio euanuit.

*the city, in vain does the guard keep watch?*" Why is it that one applies himself to the task of self-edification, thus going against the divine scriptures and his own conscience, when the edification of a person is clearly taught in these inspired words not to be certain, but vain?

First of all, I wonder what kind of edification you are talking about. If you are referring to stones and clay, you should consult the Egyptians about these things. As far as we are concerned, in this passage we understand the edification of the word of God. The word of God is proclaimed by the priests of God for sake of the edification of his church. Is the word of the priest vain? Is his doctrine useless? Is his zeal vain? And if the edification of this work is vain, why is it mandated by the apostle? In fact, the apostle Paul says: *Build one another up: may all things be done with your edification in mind.*<sup>110</sup> (h) And again: *Like a wise master builder I laid a foundation ... If anyone builds on this foundation with gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, or straw, the work of each will come to light, for the Day will disclose it. It will be revealed with fire, and the fire [itself] will test the quality of each one's work.*<sup>111</sup> The Lord in his gospel praises the wise person who builds their house on the rock, which will not be moved by the power of the winds or of the waters.<sup>112</sup> Are you therefore saying that the priests build up the Church in vain? That they are vigilant for no reason when they protect the simple sheep from the bite of the wolves? Or when they protect the flock of Christ by pronouncing against all the heretics an eternal anathema? Wherever the Catholic sheep are led to pastures, the fields grow with pure faith, *The mountains skipped like rams; the hills, like lambs.*<sup>113</sup> Everywhere, from the rising of the sun to its setting, there is one flock and one shepherd who kills the wolves so that they may not harm God's flock. So far, can't you see that the edification of a good will is not a pointless but a sure thing? Every day the house of God is built through a good word, a holy example, and excellent zeal. Every day the Lord says through the prophet: *Build houses and live in them;*<sup>114</sup> not houses of mud, that are knocked down by the wind, but houses that last over time thanks to the firmness of the stones. And yet, you consider all these things that we have just said as empty and vain. For your books say: "The edification of human beings is not certain, but vain." From the very beginning, all the saints contemplated in their minds this edification. Because of the Word, Abel was the first to build justice; Noah, innocence; Abraham, faith; Isaac, sacrifice; Jacob, the yearning for holy things; Joseph, chastity; Moses, the priesthood; Jesus the son of Nave, perseverance; David, protection of God's people; Solomon, wisdom; Johannes, penance. We have briefly remembered these people out of many, so that the reader, through them, calling to mind the others whom we have omitted, may wonder if these people really existed. If they did, how come the heretics' books say that the edification of human beings is not certain but pointless? Thus, in

<sup>110</sup> 1 Thess 5:11.

<sup>111</sup> 1 Cor 3:10, 12, 13.

<sup>112</sup> Mt 7:24.

<sup>113</sup> Ps 114:4.

<sup>114</sup> Jer 29:5.

## 17. [XII]:

Sed si contra nos uenitis, inquiunt, non contra nos uenitis, sed contra eum qui dixit: nisi dominus aedificauerit domum, in uanum laborauerunt qui aedificant eam, et: *nisi dominus custodierit ciuitatem, in uanum uigilauerunt qui custodiunt eam.* Ergo nesciit quia non erat utile populo dei qui haec fecit scribi, et ad posteros usque ad finem saeculi dirigi? Vos itaque qui ista reprehenditis, auferte haec de libro Psalmorum, quia legentes et psallentes hos uersiculos, ut dicitis, aedificari non possunt.

Nos dictum prophetae laudamus, probamus, confitemur, confirmamus et psallimus, atque hoc ordine secundum regulam catholicam explanamus. Ab initio, ut diximus, a sancto Abele iusto usque ad Zachariam et Iohannem omnes aedificauerunt domum, non caementis, ut diximus, sed sanctis exemplis. Veruntamen nisi dominus Iesus Christus uenisset, et ipse aedificasset domum hanc in qua illi laborauerunt, in uanum laborauerunt qui aedificauerant eam. Nam et uigilanter institerunt gregi, sed, nisi dominus Iesus Christus suam custodiam exhibuisset, in uanum uigilauerant custodientes eum. Vnde etiam sequitur: *in uanum est uobis ante lucem surgere.* Lux enim Christus esse et a prophetis et ab euangelistis et ab apostolis declaratur. Prophetae ergo omnes ante lucem surrexerunt, id est ante natuitatem Christi. His in uanum fuit ante lucem surgere. Non enim potuerunt noctem patientibus ueritatem ostendere. Sed uenit lux, et manifestauit occulta tenebrarum, et tunc demum laus coepit esse unicuique a deo. Nisi ergo ipse uenisset et aedificasset domum, in uanum laborauerant aedificantes eam. Nunc ergo quia uenit et aedificauit domum, iam non in uanum laborant qui aedificant eam. Et quia uenit ut custodiat ciuitatem, iam non in uanum uigilant qui custodiunt eam. Et quia lux uenit, et lucet in tenebris, iam non in uanum ante lucem surgimus. Et quia panis laetitiae de caelo descendit, iam non manducamus panem doloris. Hic enim sequitur in psalmo uersiculus. Vos, inquit, in uanum aedificatis, in uanum uigilatis, in uanum ante lucem surgitis, qui manducatis panem doloris. Nos autem qui non manducamus panem doloris, sed panem salutis, aedificemus domum nostram super petram, et uigilemus exspectantes dominum, quia nescimus diem neque horam. *Beatus ille seruus, quem, dum uenerit dominus, inuenerit uigilantem.* Si uidetur, accedamus ad reliqua.

our conclusions we criticize the sayings of the heretics from a Catholic perspective. For either these people were not real, and in this case their edification remains; or they were real, in which case the heretics' claim is groundless.

17. “But if you disagree with us, you are not really opposing us, but the one who said: Unless the Lord builds the house, its builders labor in vain. Unless the Lord watches over the city, the watchmen stand guard in vain. Must we conclude that the person who ordered these things to be written down and to be followed through future generations until the end of time, did not know they were going to be useless to the people of God? Therefore, you who criticize these views, remove these words from the book of Psalms then, since, as you say, those who read and sing these verses cannot be edified!”

We praise, believe in, confirm and extol the saying of the prophet and explain it in the following manner according to Catholic belief. Like I said, from the beginning, starting with the holy and just Abel, up to Zachary and John, all these people built a home not with stones but with their holy example. Nevertheless, if the Lord Jesus Christ had not come and built himself the house in which these people worked, those who built it would have worked in vain. With vigilance they gathered a flock; but if the Lord Jesus Christ had not offered his protection, those who watched over it would have worked in vain. Hence: *It is vain for you to rise early.*<sup>115</sup> The prophets, the evangelists and the apostles declare that Christ is the light. All the prophets were born before the light, that is, prior to Christ's birth. For these people it was of no avail to be born before the light: in fact, they were not able to show the truth to those who lived in darkness. But the light came and revealed the things hidden in darkness. It was precisely at that moment that merit began to be bestowed by God on everyone. If Jesus had not come and built the house, the builders would have worked in vain. But it is precisely because he came and built it that the workers did not toil in vain. And because he came to watch over the city, the sentinels did not stand guard in vain. And because the light came and shined in the darkness, we do not get up in vain before the rising of the sun. And because the bread of happiness descended from heaven, we do not have to eat the bread of suffering. In the Psalm's verse we read next: *To eat bread earned by hard toil.*<sup>116</sup> But we who do not eat the bread of anxious toil, but the bread of salvation, we build our home on the rock and we are vigilant, expecting the Lord's return because we do not know the day or the time.<sup>117</sup> *Blessed is that servant whom his master on arrival finds doing so.*<sup>118</sup> [But now], if you deem it opportune, let us examine the remaining issues.

---

<sup>115</sup> Ps 127:2.

<sup>116</sup> Ps 127:2.

<sup>117</sup> Mt 25:13.

<sup>118</sup> Lk 12:43.

## 18. [XV]:

Sed quid putant isti se uoluntate sua ad fructum aedificationis attingere, cum nec ipse uas electionis suam asserat se uoluntatem implere potuisse? Dicit enim de se ipso apostolus: *non quod uolo bonum hoc ago, sed quod nolo malum illud facio*. Si ergo apostolus quod uult bonum implere non praeualeat, quomodo isti dicunt per uoluntatem suam ad fructum se posse gratiae peruenire?

Numquam festinat ad ueniam qui longum uult esse quod peccat. Da ueniam, magister gentium, quaesumus. Ne nos participes iniuriarum tuarum esse permittas. Videamus ergo quid uolebat apostolus et facere non ualebat, et quid est quod cogebatur facere quod nolebat. Volebat uerum loqui, mentiri autem penitus non uolebat. Ergo mentiebatur. Volebat pudicitiam, impudicitiam perhorrebat. Ergo polluebatur. Volebat contemptum mundi, exsecrabatur omnem gloriam saeculi. Ergo cenodoxus, id est inanis gloriae cupidus existebat. Postremo uolebat omne bonum, omne autem quod est malum omnimodis exhorrebat. Nihil ergo bonum quod uolebat apostolus operabatur, sed omne quod est nequissimum perpetrabat. Dicitis enim: “dicit de se ipso apostolus: *non quod uolo bonum hoc ago, sed malum quod nolo illud facio*.” Videtis ne, obsecro, in qua blasphemiorum fouea caecus sensus uester uos praecipites dederit? Apostolum criminibus occupatum fuisse uultis ostendere ut nemo se peccatorem esse suspiret, nemo imi cordis gemitum pro suis sceleribus reddat, nec studeat quispiam flentibus lauare oculis quod concupiscentibus inquinauit, cum audiat illum uas electionis, illum magistrum omnium ecclesiarum, non bonum quod uoluisse se memorat, sed malum quod noluisse se asserit perpetrasse. Aperiuitis portas non iustitiae, sed iniquitatis omnibus hominibus, et ex uerbis apostoli contra apostolum bella sumpsistis, uolentes esse magistri, cum numquam fuisse uos discipulos ostendatis, et sonum litterae attendentes ipsi uobis subito coepistis esse doctores. Quid nunc facimus, qui uestras blasphemias non duramus? Si tacuerimus, uos uidemini recte dixisse, nec solum dixisse, sed etiam scripsisse. Loquimur iuuante domino fugientes gloriam hominum, nescios docentes, studiosos instruentes, scientes laetificantes, uos detegentes. Scriptura libri uestri est quae, quod peius est, uobis morientibus illa non moritur, et ad euentus incautos tamquam cancer serpit.

18. “But why do these people believe they can attain the fruit of edification by their own will power, when not even the vessel of election himself claims he was able to fulfil his will? For the apostle said about himself: *For I do not do the good I want, but I do the evil I do not want.*<sup>119</sup> Therefore, if the Apostle, who wants to do good, does not succeed in accomplishing it, how can these people possibly say they are able to attain the fruit of grace through their own will?”

Those who wish to indulge in their sin never hurry to receive forgiveness. Extend to us your forgiveness, apostle of the nations, we beseech you, and do not allow us to have any part in insulting you. Let us see therefore what is it that the apostle wanted and did not want to do. He wanted to speak the truth, but deep inside he did not want to lie; and yet, he lied. He wanted chastity and feared shamelessness, yet he was contaminated. He wanted to despise the world and detested all the glory of the world; yet he lived yearning for an empty glory. Finally, he wanted every good, and abhorred everything that is evil in every respect; and yet, the apostle did not do the things he wanted to but committed everything that was most evil. For you say: “The apostle says about himself: *For I do not do the good I want, but I do the evil I do not want.*” Can’t you see into what pit of blasphemies your blind interpretation has led you? You want to show that the apostle was bent on sins so that no one would yearn to become a sinner; so that no one would groan from the depth of their hearts for their evil deeds; so that no one would have to wash with tearful eyes what they polluted with lustful eyes. When he hears that, Paul, that vessel of election and teacher of all churches remembers that he committed not the good that he wanted, but the evil he did not want. You have not opened the doors to justice but to the iniquity of all people and waged war against the apostle using his own very words. Yearning to be teachers, though you demonstrate that you have never been his disciples, and paying attention to the sound of the letter, suddenly you began to be skillful teachers unto yourselves. What should all of us who cannot stand your blasphemies do? If we remain silent, you will appear not only to have spoken correctly but also to have written good things. With the help of the Lord, we resolve to speak up, avoiding human glory, teaching the ignorant, instructing the zealous, cheering the knowledgeable and exposing you for what you really are. Worse yet, long after you are gone the ideas contained in your book will go on, and like a cancer infect careless people, confusing them.

---

<sup>119</sup> Rom 7:19.

19. [XIV] Videamus quid sequatur liber a uestra uanitate conscriptus:  
 apostoli uerba sunt, nostrum nihil adiungimus. Ipse de se dicit:  
*non quod uolo bonum hoc ago, sed quod nolo malum illud facio.*

Arrius in tertio libro suo epigramma huiusmodi posuit dicens: “nos uerba filii dei accepimus, et uera credimus, uera etiam confitemur. Ipse dicit: *pater maior me est*,” et *ego et pater unum sumus, quia ego in patre, et pater in me* noluit legere. Iungere enim potuit duo ista, id est *pater maior me est*, et *ego et pater unum sumus*, et, dum ista duo iunxit, inuenerat filium hominis et filium dei. Omnia enim possibilitatis genera a deitate sublata soli filio hominis poterant conuenire. Deus enim nec minor, nec maior est, sed hoc est quod est idem semper, carens crementum, carens detrimentum. Numquam augmentando proficit, numquam deficit minuendo, sed ante omnia idem qui post omnia, et in omnibus praeteritis, praesentibus et futuris immutabilis perseuerat. Haec quasi in alio opere dicta sint. Memorauimus enim anathemabilem Arrium in tertii libri sui capite hoc dixisse, ordine quo praedestinati dixerunt: “apostoli uerba sunt, nostrum nihil addimus. Ipse dicit de se: *non quod uolo bonum hoc ago, sed quod odi malum hoc facio.*” Vestram nunc interrogamus prudentiam. Apostolum legimus dixisse: *uiuo autem iam non ego, uiuit uero in me Christus, quod autem nunc in carne uiuo, in fide uiuo dei.* Quid nunc dicitis? Carnalis erat uir iste, an spiritualis? Si dixeritis carnalis, conuincemini. Clamat enim: *uiuo iam non ego, uiuit uero in me Christus.* Si consenseritis quod spiritualis fuerit, nobis cum istum locum explanabitis. Caput enim loci huius in hoc sermone reperies quod inquit: *scimus quod lex spiritualis est, ego autem carnalis sum.* Si carnalis es, beate apostole, quomodo arguis carnales dicens: *et ego, fratres, non potui uobis loqui quasi spiritualibus, sed quasi carnalibus?* Et iterum: *cum dicatur, inquit, in uobis zelus et contentio, nonne carnales estis?* Et iterum: *quotquot, inquit, spiritales sumus, haec sapimus.* Docemur autem scriptis tuis, uir dei, quod non solum ipse spiritualis fueris, et in terra positus iure dices conuersationem tuam esse in caelis, uerum etiam hoc docemur, quod et discipuli tui spiritales fuerint. Ais enim ad eos: *si praeuentus quis fuerit in aliquo delicto, uos, qui spiritales estis, corripite huiusmodi in spiritu mansuetudinis.* Quid ergo nunc nobis dicens: *scimus quia lex spiritualis est, ego autem carnalis sum?* Ad haec ipse nobis dignabitur dare responsum: *factus sum carnalibus quasi carnalis, ut eos qui carnales erant lucrifacerem.* Aperuit se nobis ueritas, et fallacia est a ueritate exclusa. Personam itaque carnalis hominis in se magister spiritualis exceptit. Et ne quasi iniuriosus doctor a se repelleret auditorem, se increpat ut alium corrigat. Vnde hoc ipsum alibi commemorat dicens: *aut numquid peccatum feci me*

19. Let us see what comes next in the book written by your vanity: The words are the apostle's: we do not add anything of ours to them. The apostle says about himself: *For I do not do the good I want, but I do the evil I do not want.*

Arius, in his third book, wrote an epigram that reads: "We received the words of the Son of God, and believed them to be true and confess them as such. Jesus said: *The Father is greater than I, and The Father and I are one, because I am in the Father and the Father is in me.*" Arius did not want to read on, for if he had been able to connect these two sentences he would have found Jesus to be both the Son of Man and the Son of God. All the characteristics of weakness, assumed by the deity, were able to converge only in the Son of Man. God is neither lesser or greater, but is unchanging, not subject to growth or liable to diminish. He never gained anything by growth, nor lacked anything by lowering himself. He who remains immutable in all things, past, present, future, is after all things and is the same before them. Almost the same things will be repeated in another work [of his]. We have recalled that the execrable Arius at the beginning of his third book had this to say in regard to what the Predestinarians now claim: "The words are the Apostle's; we have not added anything of ours." The apostle said about himself: *I do not do the good that I want, but the evil that I hate.* At this point, we wish to question your common sense. We have read what the apostle said: *Yet I live, no longer I, but Christ lives in me; insofar as I now live in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God.*<sup>120</sup> What do you say now? Was this man a carnal or a spiritual man? If you say "carnal," you must convince us, for he claims: *I live, no longer I, but Christ lives in me.* If you agree that he was spiritual, you need to explain to us this passage. You will find the beginning of this text in this word that says: *We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal.*<sup>121</sup> If you are a carnal man, o blessed apostle, how can you blame carnal Christians by saying: *Brothers, I could not talk to you as spiritual people, but as fleshly people;*<sup>122</sup> and again: *While there is jealousy and rivalry among you, are you not of the flesh?*<sup>123</sup> and again: "Those of us who are spiritual, know these things." We are taught in your writings, o man of God, not only that you yourself are a spiritual man, and while living on earth you rightly said that your home was in heaven, but also that your disciples were spiritual people. For he says to them: *Brothers, even if a person is caught in some transgression, you who are spiritual should correct that one in a gentle spirit.*<sup>124</sup> Why, then Paul, do you say to us: *We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal?* He was good enough to give an answer to these things: "I have become almost carnal to carnal people, in order to win them over." Behold, truth has disclosed itself to us and deception is excluded from the truth. The spiritual teacher received in himself the person of the

---

<sup>120</sup> Gal 2:20.

<sup>121</sup> Rom 7:14.

<sup>122</sup> 1 Cor 3:1.

<sup>123</sup> 1 Cor 3:3.

<sup>124</sup> Gal 6:1.

*humilians ut uos exaltemini? Quid ergo? Ego, inquit, carnalis sum. Qui tu? Ego, inquit, qui uenundatus sum sub peccato. Numquid tu, apostole, uenundatus es sub peccato, qui olim Christi sanguine redemptus, innumerabilem per Christum deo populum redemisti? Constat ergo quod non suam apostolus, sed alterius, id est carnalis uiri, uoluit hoc loco declarare personam. Ille est uenundatus sub peccato, qui adhuc Christi sanguine redemptus non est, qui adhuc carnalis, et ideo dicitur quia *filius carnis* est, et ideo dicit: *quod operor non intelligo*. Non enim intelligit operationem suam gentilis contra salutem suam esse, qui licet sit gentilis, bonum sibi uult prouenire, bonum adipisci, bonum possidere, bonum acquirere, bonum salutis suae, bonum uitae suae, sed non quod uult bonum hoc exercet, sed quod odit malum hoc facit. Odit mortem, sed opera mortis exercet. Odit periculum, sed operatio eius plena est periculo. Odit omnia mala, sed quae odit haec operatur. Quare? Quia *non habitat in carne mea*, inquit, *bonum*, id est: “non habitat in me deus uerus. Nam uelle adiacet mihi, deum uerum me uelle certum est, sed hoc quod uolo non inuenio.” Occurrunt enim mihi homini carnali, homini uenundato sub peccato, homini qui quod operor non intelligo. homini qui *non quod uolo bonum hoc ago, sed quod nolo malum illud facio*, homini in cuius carne non habitat bonum, occurrunt mihi ista omnia ut perficere bonum non inueniam. *Condelector tamen legi dei secundum interiorem hominem*, id est interior homo meus in quo est intellectus meus, condelectatur legi dei, quae dicit unum et inuisibilem deum debere adorari. Quamuis enim carnalis sim, scio lignum et lapidem deum esse non posse, sed uideo aliam legem contra sensum meum repugnantem legi mentis meae, quae dicit et probat hos deos esse non posse. Repugnat tamen lex haec carnalis legi mentis meae. Et captiuum me dicit in lege peccati, quae lex non est in mente mea, sed in membris meis. Corpore enim ducor ubi animo non consentio. *Infelix ego homo!* Non hoc de se dicit Paulus. Non enim erat infelix, sed beatus et sanctus est.*

*Infelix, inquit, ego homo! Quis me liberabit de corpore mortis huius? Gratia dei per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum.* Veniet ergo gratia baptismatis sacri, et carnalem hunc facit spiritalem, et uenundatum sub peccato redimet a peccato, et iam non dicit: *quod operor non intelligo*. Non enim quod odit malum hoc agit, sed quod uult bonum hoc faciet. Scit enim quoniam iam habitat in carne eius bonum, id est spiritus sanctus, per

carnal man. And the doctor, in order to avoid discouraging a listener by sounding offensive, blames himself in order to correct the other. Elsewhere, he mentions this very thing, saying: *Did I make a mistake when I humbled myself so that you might be exalted?*<sup>125</sup> Now what? He said: “I am a carnal being.” Could that really be you, Paul? *I am sold into slavery to sin.*<sup>126</sup> Could you be so, o apostle, you who have been sold to sin, who one day, having been redeemed by the blood of Christ, redeemed a great number of people through Christ? It appears that the apostle wanted to address in this verse not his own person, but somebody else, namely the person of a carnal human being. He/she has been sold to sin, he/she who until now had not been redeemed by the blood of Christ, for he/she is still carnal. Thus, because he is the son of flesh, he said: *What I do, I do not understand.*<sup>127</sup> Gentiles did not understand that their work acted against their salvation. Gentiles want to attain the good by themselves, to acquire good, to own it, namely the good of their salvation, the good of their lives. And yet, they do not toil because they want this good, but because they hate this very evil that they do. They hate death, but practice the works of death; they hate danger, but their deeds are full of dangers; they hate all bad things, but they do these very same things. For what reason? Because *I know that good does not dwell in me,*<sup>128</sup> that is, the true God does not dwell in me. *The willing is ready at hand*, namely, it is certain that I want the true God, but [in regard to that which want] *I do not do the good I want.*<sup>129</sup> These things happen to me as a carnal human being, as a person sold to sin, as a person who does what they don't understand, as a person who don't do the good they want, but the evil they do not want, as a person in whom goodness is not to be found. All these things happen to me, so that I may not be found to do what is good. *For I take delight in the law of God, in my inner self:*<sup>130</sup> in other words, in the inner person, in whom my understanding resides, who rejoices in the law of God which says that the one and undivided God must be worshipped. Even though I may be carnal I know that wood and stone cannot be God; but I see another law fighting against my understanding of the law of my mind that says and proves that these objects cannot be gods. This law is opposed to the carnal law of my mind and leads me as a prisoner to the law of sin, which does not rule as a law in my mind, but in my body. I am led by my body where I do not assent to go with my soul. *Miserable one that I am!* Paul does not say this about himself, for he was not unhappy, but blessed and holy.

*Miserable one that I am! Who will deliver me from this mortal body? Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord.*<sup>131</sup> Therefore, may the grace of holy baptism come and turn the carnal person into a spiritual one, and may it redeem from sin the one who is subject to it. Paul doesn't say about himself: “I do not understand what I do.” It's not because

<sup>125</sup> 2 Cor 11:7.

<sup>126</sup> Rom 7:14.

<sup>127</sup> Rom 7:15.

<sup>128</sup> Rom 7:18.

<sup>129</sup> Rom 7:18,19.

<sup>130</sup> Rom 7:22.

<sup>131</sup> Rom 7:24,25.

quem et uelle ei adiacet, et perficere inueniet pro sua bona uoluntate. Iamque securus condelectatur legi dei secundum interiorem hominem, quia non uidet aliam legem in membris suis. Solam enim legem Christi in se habet, quae non repugnat legi mentis eius, et non eum dicit captiuum in lege peccati, sed liberum eum dicit ad uitam aeternam. Et iam non infelix homo, sed felix ego homo, quia haec omnia mala euasi, et haec omnia bona inueni. Quis autem hoc mihi praestitit, si requiris: *gratia dei per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum*. Et ne remaneret expositionis huius ambiguitas, qua putaretur apostolus de se ista dixisse, ponit uerba increpatiuo modo legenda, quibus ait: *igitur ipse ego mente seruio legi dei, carne autem legi peccati. Nihil ergo damnationis est in Christo Iesu his qui secundum carnem ambulant*. Hoc est, si ego, qui sum apostolus, carnalis existimor, nihil habebunt damnationis hi qui carnaliter uiuunt? Et adiecit: *lex autem spiritus et uitae liberauit te a lege peccati et mortis*. Vnde et in alio loco dicit: *cum serui essetis peccati, liberi fuistis iustitiae. Nunc autem liberati a peccato, serui facti estis dei*. Deus autem in eo de seruitiis omnium gloriatur, quia seruitia quae habet nullis poterunt seruitiis comparari. Vniuersa enim seruitia coactiua noscuntur, dei autem seruitia, nisi uoluntaria fuerint, stare non possunt, secundum hoc quod scriptum est: “pater neminem trahit in uitum.” Vnde propheta plenus spiritu sancto clamat: *ex uoluntate mea confitebor domino*. Et iterum: *uoluntarie sacrificabo tibi*.

20. [XV] Sed his omnibus contrarii librum nobis proferunt caecis ambagibus circumdatum, et, quasi nescium sui, iterum eadem repetentem atque dicentem:  
 non uocantur nisi praedestinati. Antecedit enim gratia dei uoluntatem hominis. Prior est enim deus in bono hominis. Homo autem in omni bono uix nouissimus inuenitur. Date primas partes deo, ut superbiam euacuetis humanam. Quod si uolueritis superbiam nutrire hominibus, apparel uos ruinam generis humani perquirere, qui docetis in bono opere non deum antecedere, sed hominis uoluntatem, ut ipsi uideantur magis deum, ut bonum faciat, suis suggestionibus admonere, quasi qui non faceret bonum nisi ipsi dixissent, cum constet deum nullo sugerente, nullo rogante bona omnia hominibus condonare. Non enim dixit apostolus: cum rogaremus et peteremus et curremrus et uigilaremus, sed, *cum inimici essemus, reconciliati sumus deo*, non per uoluntatem nostram, sed *per mortem filii eius*. Vbi est uoluntas hominis? Exclusa est. Non ergo omnis qui uult, saluatur, quia, si omnis qui uellet saluaretur, nullus

he hates the evil that he does it, but it's because he wants the good that he does it. He knows that the good (namely the Holy Spirit) already dwells in his body, who enables him to will and to accomplish good things according to his good will. He is already secure and rejoices in the law of God according to his inner person, since he does not see another law at work in his members. He has only the law of Christ in himself, which is not contrary to the law of his mind and which does not lead him as a prisoner to the law of sin, but rather leads him free to eternal life. Therefore, Paul should not say, "I am a miserable man," but "I am a happy man, because I have escaped all evil things and found all these other good things instead. Who is better than me, if not *the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ?*" And in order to eliminate from his explanation any traces of ambiguity, according to which it is thought that the apostle had said these things about himself, he wrote words to be read in a resounding way, in which he said: *Therefore, I myself, with my mind, serve the law of God but, with my flesh, the law of sin.*<sup>132</sup> Then, he goes on to say: *Hence, now there is no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus who walk in the flesh.*<sup>133</sup> (i) This means that, if I, an apostle, am considered carnal, will those who live in a carnal manner have no condemnation? And then he added: *For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has freed you from the law of sin and death.*<sup>134</sup> (j) Hence, in another place we read: *When you were slaves of sin, you were free from righteousness... But now you have been freed from sin and have become slaves of God.*<sup>135</sup> However, God is glorified in this, namely in the subjugation of all people, because the servitude we are talking about cannot be compared to all other types of slavery. All types of slavery are known to be coercive, but subjugation to God, unless it is a voluntary thing, cannot exist according to what has been written: "The Father does not draw anyone against their will." (k) Hence the prophet filled with Holy Spirit exclaims: *I will give praise to the Lord willingly.* (l)<sup>136</sup> And again: *I will willingly sacrifice to Thee.*<sup>137</sup> (m)

20. And yet, being opposed to all these things, they use against us this book filled with blind and tortuous arguments. This book, at times almost self-contradictory, repeats over and over the same things, saying:

People are not called unless they are predestined, for the grace of God precedes the will of human beings. God comes first in the good that they do; but a person, even an excellent one, is last in every good thing he/she does. Give the first part to God, in order to get rid of human pride. For if you want to feed one's pride, we may conclude that you are seeking the ruin of humankind, because you teach that in any good work what comes first is not God, but rather a person's will. They teach this so that they themselves, rather than God, may appear to heed to their own suggestions to do good, as if God would not do good unless they themselves told him to, when instead it is obvious that God gives good things to everybody without

<sup>132</sup> Rom 7:25.

<sup>133</sup> Rom 8:1.

<sup>134</sup> Rom 8:2.

<sup>135</sup> Rom 6:20-22.

<sup>136</sup> Ps 28:7.

<sup>137</sup> Ps 53:8.

poterat a salute effici alienus. Omnis itaque homo saluari uult, sed non omnis saluatur homo. Saluatur enim is quem uoluerit deus. Vtique, inquam, is quem uoluerit deus, ut exclusa hominis uoluntate suam plenam ex integro gratiam manifestet.

Beatos dico priores nostros, qui tantum facinoris usum minime cognouerunt. Quis umquam suspicaretur de rebus bonis contra bonitatem agendum, et contra iustitiam armis iustitiae dimicandum? “Non uocantur, inquit, nisi praedestinati.” Et nos uobis cum dicimus: “non uocantur nisi praedestinati.” Nam qui omnes gentes iussit discipulis suis ut uocarent dicens: *euntes baptizate omnes gentes*, omnes ipse ante aduentum suum praedestinavit. Omnes ergo gentes praedestinavit ad uitam, quia omnes gentes uocauit ad uitam. Qui uenerit, imputabit diuinae clementiae praedestinanti pariter et uocanti. Qui autem non uenerit, imputet suae negligentiae contemnenti pariter et nolenti. Non est enim diuinae praedestinationis ut hominis perditio fieret, nec uoluntas dei est, quando diaboli uoluntas impletur. Inimici enim sibi sunt istae et contrariae uoluntates, et non potest una fieri absque contemptu alterius. Quod si non uocantur aliqui ad uitam, in illis qui non uocantur diaboli uoluntas impletur. Et miror qua fronde eius intretis ecclesiam quem dicere non timetis diaboli uoluntati subiectum. Diaboli enim uoluntatem implere probatur qui non uult omnes homines pertingere ad salutem. Sicut enim in his quos uult saluare suam creditur uoluntatem implere, sic in istis quos non uult, diaboli uoluntas impletur. Sed bonus deus bonos esse uult omnes. Et hinc errorem patimini, quia omnes quos bonos esse uult, boni non sunt. Soletis enim dicere: “qui non sunt boni, deo eos a se repellente mali sunt” ut hi qui peccant, uideantur non suo uitio esse peccantes. Si ergo hinc errorem patimini, quod dei uoluntas non impleatur, cur non magis hinc iudicium detis peccantibus, quo laudetur deus de suae patientia pietatis, et culpetur homo de impatientia propriae uoluntatis?

21. [XVI] Dicitis enim:

ergo homo uincit deum. Vincit enim deum, si deus eum uult esse bonum, et bonus non est.

any need on his part for people's suggestions or requests. The apostle does not say *We were reconciled to God* when we pray, but *when we were enemies*; and again, not through our own will, but *through the death of his Son*. So, where is the human will? It is excluded. For what reason? Because not everyone who wants to be saved will be saved; if that was the case, no one will be kept from being saved. As a matter of fact, everybody wants to be saved, but not everyone will be. Only those whom God wants to be saved will be saved: only whomever God wants to be saved, will be saved, so that, excluding a person's will, God's explicit will may be manifested anew.

I say that our forerunners were fortunate since they hardly suspected the existence of such a mischievous view. Who would ever suspect that it is necessary to act against goodness, against good things, and to fight against justice with the weapons of justice? Paul said that no one is called except for the predestined. On this, we agree with you. In fact, Jesus, who instructed his disciples to call all people by saying: *Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them*,<sup>138</sup> predestined everybody before his coming. Thus, he predestined all people to eternal life, since he called them all to eternal life. Those who will answer the call should attribute it to divine mercy, which is equally predestinating and calling. Conversely, those who will not come should attribute it to their own negligence, which is both a contemptuous and unwilling attitude. For the damnation of some people does not take place due to divine predestination; nor is it God's will when the devil's will is carried out. In fact, these two wills are opposed and inimical to each other and one cannot assert itself without being despised by the other. If it is true that some people are not called to life, in such case the will of the devil is fulfilled in them. I am amazed that you bring into the Church a person who you are not afraid to say is subject to the devil's will. In fact, a God who doesn't want all people to attain salvation is proven to fulfill the devil's wish. Just as in those people whom God wants to save his will is believed to be fulfilled, likewise in these people whom he doesn't want to save the will of the devil is fulfilled instead. But a good God wants everybody to be good. It is at this crucial point that you commit a mistake, because all those people whom God wants to be good are in fact not good. You are used to say: "Those who are not good, since God pushes them away from himself, are evil so that these people who sin may be shown to be truly sinners, though not because of their own vice." If you incur this error, namely, to believe that God's will is not fulfilled, why don't you pass judgement on sinners instead, so that God may be praised for the patience that stems from his mercy, and so that a person may be blamed for the impatience arising from his/her own will?

21. For you say:

Otherwise, if God wanted someone to be good, and that person turns out to be evil instead, in that case we may say that a person has triumphed over God. Indeed, a human being was able to defeat God, if God wanted him/her to be good and he/she turns out to be evil instead.

---

<sup>138</sup> Mt 28:19.

Quid ergo hoc loco attenditis uos? Numquid luctantem uidetis deum et hominem ut ista dicatis? Si luctantem uideretis, recte uni parti uictoriā traderetis. Nunc autem quia medici normam tenens saluator hominum, dat monita, non suae utilitati necessaria, sed nostrae salutis utilia, quaedam fieri iubet ut uitam obtineas, quaedam prohibet fieri ut mortem euadas. Si audieris, imputabis saluatori quod uiues, si contempseris, tuae reputabis ignauiae, dum coeporis mortis sentire tormenta. Quod si tu dicas mortem aegroti medici imperitia euenisse, nos docemus medicum ex omni parte perfectum. Si autem dixeris eius uoluntate mortis interitum deuolutum, ipse tibi exclamat dicens: *nolo mortem peccatoris*. Quem si interrogare merearis et dicas: “si hoc non uis, ostende quid uelis,” respondebit: “uolo ut conuertatur et uiuat.” Vnde facimus et nos clausulam catholicam uestris astutiis obuiantem. Si potest homo deo nolente delinquere, quanto magis potest deo uolente delictis finem imponere? Si potest homo uelle quod deus non uult, quanto magis potest homo uelle quod deus uult? Si potest homo deo nolente perire, quanto magis potest deo uolente saluari? Si potuit homo deo nolente implere uoluntatem diaboli, quanto magis potest deo uolente implere uoluntatem dei? Si potuit homo praedestinationem dei sua auersatione contemnere, quanto magis potest praedestinationem dei sua conuersione complere? Dixit itaque deus: “hoc nolo, illud uolo,” id est dixit: “*nolo mortem* morientis, uolo ut conuertatur et uiuat.” Quod dixit “uolo,” hoc praedestinavit (nihil enim praedestinavit inuitus), quod dixit “nolo,” destituit. Si potest homo uelle et facere quod deus non uult, quanto magis potest et uelle et facere quod deus uult? De perditione hic agitur hominis et salute. Deus uult ut saluemur, diabolus uult ut pereamus. Si potest fieri perditio hominis, quam uult diabolus per nostram negligentiam, quanto magis potest fieri liberatio hominis, quam uult deus, per diligentiam bonae et fidelissimae uoluntatis?

22. [XVII] Sed dicit liber uester:  
antecedit gratia dei uoluntatem hominis.

Nos dicimus: “non solum antecedit, sed etiam sequitur dei gratia hominis uoluntatem.” Prius tamen quam ostendamus quomodo antecedit et quomodo sequatur, uos exponimus quid uelitis ostendere. Dicitis itaque: “antecedit gratia dei hominis uoluntatem,” ut, dum audierit homo tam dignam tamque ueram sententiam, illud quod sequitur non attendat, sed uobis exponentibus discat ut cessest uoluntas hominis, ne dum coepirit uelle, deum excitare uideatur in zelum, exspectet ut prius gratia ueniat quae nolentem trahat, quae cogat fastidientem, quae teneat fugientem. Volutetur homo in caeno, efficiatur

What are you trying to say? Are you saying that you see God and human beings struggling against each other? If you have noticed a struggle, you would be right to attribute victory to one of the two. But now, since the Savior of humankind as a physician gives warnings that are not necessary for himself but helpful for our salvation, he thereby orders that some things may happen so that you may obtain life or forbids some things from happening so that you may escape an undesirable outcome. If you heed his instructions, you should attribute it to the Savior if you live. However, if you despise his advice, you should blame your laziness when you begin to feel the pangs of death. But if you say that death resulted due to the inexperience of an unskilled physician, on the contrary we teach that the physician is blameless under every respect. But if you say that death took place because the physician wished it, he himself has an answer for you when he says: *I desire not the death of the ungodly.*<sup>139</sup> If you asked him: “If you do not want their death, tell me what you want,” he would reply: *I want them to repent and live.* Hence, we introduce a Catholic explanation that runs counter to your skillful arguments. If a person is able to sin, though God does not want them to, how much more a person can put an end to their crimes when God wants it! If a person is able to want what God does not want, how much more people are able to want what God wants! If a person can perish against God’s will, how much more they can be saved with God’s will! If a person was able to carry out the devil’s will against God’s will, how much more they can fulfill God’s will with the latter’s help! If a person, by being rebellious, was able to care little for God’s predestination, how much more they can fulfil God’s predestination through their repentance! Thus, God said: “I do not want the former, but the latter,” meaning: “I do not want the death of sinners, but that they may repent and live.” What he said he wanted, this indeed he predestined, for he did not predestine anything against his will; that about which he said “I do not want,” he put aside. If a person can want and do what God doesn’t want, how much more they can do and want what God wants them to! What is at stake here is a person’s salvation or perdition. God wants us to be saved, the devil wants us to be lost. If the damnation of human beings, willed by God, is liable to occur due to the former’s negligence, how much more their salvation, willed by God, will take place through the diligence of a good and most faithful will.

22. But your book says:

The grace of God precedes the will of human beings.

We say that the grace of God not only precedes but also follows people’s will. However, before we show in what way it precedes and in what way it follows, we want to show you the consequences of what you are saying. You say: “The grace of God precedes a person’s will,” so that when a person hears such a worthy and true statement they may not pay attention to that which follows, but that they may be taught with your arguments that the will of human beings comes to an end; and so that, when they begin to want, they may not appear to induce God to become zealous; so that they

---

<sup>139</sup> Ez 33:11.

faex cloacarum, et criminum gurgitibus demergatur, et sit securus ex uitio. Si enim uenerit gratia antecedens, erit homo recedens a crimen. Non enim prior erit homo dei gratiae, sed gratia dei prior erit hominis uoluntati. Deteximus hoc uestrum studium. Nunc contra hoc quid catholici teneamus, necesse est ut iustis assertionibus demonstremus. Memores estote quia uobis cum diximus: “antecedit gratia dei hominis uoluntatem.” Diximus itaque: “et antecedit, et sequitur.” Antecedit quia non potentibus, non rogantibus, non etiam uolentibus nobis, uenit filius dei uniuersum mundum a morte eripere, et ut ascenderet ad deum homo, sicut iam diximus, deus descendit ad hominem. Venit inuitare esurientes ad epulas, sitientes ad fontem, miseros ad fortitudinem, mendicos ad diuicias, tristes ad laetitiam, uenditos ad redemptionem, seruos ad libertatem, captiuos ad requiem. Ecce hoc loco docemus quod antecedit gratia dei uoluntatem hominis. Nunc uideamus quomodo iterum ipsa sequatur, quae antecesserat, subsequendo. Gratia enim quae antecessit, ostendit quid petas, quem petas, et qualiter petas. Ostendit quid quaeras, qualiter quaeras, ubi quaeras. Ostendit quid pulses, ubi pulses, qualiter pulses. Et ab hac indagine nullum exclusit. Non solum nullum exclusit, sed etiam cunctos uniuersaliter inuitauit dicens: *omnis enim qui petit accipit, et qui quaerit inuenit, et pulsanti aperietur.* Et iterum dixit: *numquid filius si petit panem patrem suum, lapidem porrigit ei? aut si piscem petierit, numquid serpentem porrigit ei? Si ergo uos, cum sitis mali, nostis bona data dare filiis uestris, quanto magis pater uester, qui in caelis est, dabit bona potentibus se?* Potentibus utique. Sicut ergo te cum dixi in superiori loco quia antecedit gratia dei uoluntatem hominis, ita nunc me cum dic in isto loco, antecedit uoluntas hominis gratiam dei, non superbiendo, sed petendo, non extollendo, sed quaerendo, non luctando, sed pulsando. Nisi enim ex fide uoluerit, nullus ei baptismatis donum gratiae diuinae impertit. Nisi, inquam, ex fide uoluerit credere, non erit particeps indulgentiae. Nisi ex fide desiderauerit, ad donum dei peruenire non poterit. Si enim ad Christum ueniens dixerit gentilis: “nolo baptizari,” baptizari non poterit. Si ad paenitentiae fructum delinquens ueniens dixerit: “nolo reconciliari,” reconciliari non poterit. Vtrosque sacerdotalis censura examinat, quibus nihil gratiae conferre praeualeat, nisi integerimam ex ore eorum didicerit uoluntatem, aut, si ausus est, uos ipsi cognoscite.

Maius aliquid dicamus. Si etiam infirmitatis uis sermonis auferat facultatem, nullatenus poterit tacenti gratiae dei copia ministrari. Mentis enim secretum nisi linguae internuntio fuerit declaratum, consequi non ualebit gratiam. *Corde enim creditur*

may wait for grace to come first, a grace that draws an unwilling person, coerces a recalcitrant person, and keeps a person who wants to run away, close by. According to you, though people may roll in mud, float on the scum of sewers and drown in the vortex of crimes, they will still be safe from vices. If preventer grace is bestowed, such people will desist from their crimes, since [according to your view] a person does not anticipate God's grace, but instead the grace of God precedes their will. We have unmasked this claim of yours. Now, we need to demonstrate with right arguments what we, as Catholics, hold against this view of yours. Do not forget that we agree with you when you say: "The grace of God precedes the will of man." But then we go on to say: "It both precedes and follows it." It precedes, because the Son of Man came to free the whole world from the power of death, even though we do not want, ask or pray for this to happen. As we have already said, in order for human beings to rise to God, God lowered himself to become a man. He came to invite the hungry to a banquet; the thirsty, to a spring; the weak to strength; the poor to riches; the unhappy to happiness; the one who had been sold, to redemption; slaves, to freedom; prisoners, to freedom. It is in this sense that we teach that the grace of God precedes the human will. Now let us see in what way this same grace follows a person's will by coming after what it preceded. For this grace that preceded you showed what you may ask for, whom you may ask to and how; it showed what you may seek, how and where you may seek it; it showed what, where and how you may knock; and it did not exclude anybody from this search. Not only it did not exclude anybody, but it also invited everybody in a truly inclusive fashion: *For everyone who asks, receives; and the one who seeks, finds; and to the one who knocks, the door will be opened;*<sup>140</sup> And again: *Which one of you would hand his son a stone when he asks for a loaf of bread, or a snake when he asks for a fish? If you then, who are wicked, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your heavenly Father give good things to those who ask him.*<sup>141</sup> Especially to those who ask, if I may say so! As I told you beforehand, namely that the grace of God precedes the will of human beings, likewise, in this context, you should agree with me that their will precedes the grace of God; not by becoming prideful, but by asking; not by showing off, but by seeking; not by struggling, but by knocking. If a person did not want out of faith, no one should impart them the gift of divine grace, namely baptism; if one did not want to believe out of faith, they will not be a fellow sharer in God's forgiveness; if they did not desire out of faith, they would not attain the gift of God. If, a Gentile, coming to Christ, had said: "I do not want to be baptized," such person could not be baptized. If a sinner, coming to the fruit of penance had said: "I do not wish to be reconciled," such person would not be able to be reconciled. The priest's discernment examines both types to see on whom it is not expedient to bestow grace unless he discerned a very clear intent on someone's part; you yourselves know what his decision was [in some instances].

Allow me to make another point. While the power of God's Word removes the condition of weakness, the abundance of God's grace will absolutely not be bestowed

---

<sup>140</sup> Mt 7:8.

<sup>141</sup> Mt 7:9–11.

*ad iustitiam, ore autem fiet confessio ad salutem.* Dicente ergo domino: *omnis qui petit, accipit*, antecedere uidetur uoluntas potentis, ut possit concedi potentibus gratia tribuentis. Et ne forte fluctuantem te in hoc loco uidear reliquisse, qui omne bonum gratiae tribuis, non me cum laboras, non solum tunc dicam antecessisse gratiam, cum deus, adiungi homini non dignatus, non potentibus nobis uenire dignatus est, sed et usque hodie antecedit uoluntas dei uoluntatem hominis. Vult enim ut saluemur, et nos nolumus. Vae autem mihi et mei similibus, quia quotidie antecedit uoluntates nostras et gratia et inuitatio et uoluntas dei et compunctio et promissio gaudii sempiterni et terror aeterni supplicii. Quotidie ergo praecedit uoluntates nostras gratia dei, innumerabilibus plena suffragiis, sed nostra uoluntas uniuersa ista dei dona non sequitur.

23. Quid ergo dicit liber uester?

Praecedit uoluntatem hominis uoluntas dei.

Et nos quid diximus? Et praecedit, et sequitur. Quid ergo laborauimus loquentes? Quia uos tantummodo “praecedit” dicitis, “sequitur” denegatis. Ipsum autem quod dicitis quia praecedit, idcirco dicitis ut homo in criminibus positus uelle suum faciat quiescere, et exspectet ut ueniat ad eum prior gratia, ne incipiat uelle suum anteponere gratiae dei. Nos autem catholici haec exsecramur et dicimus: “antecedit gratia uoluntatem hominum ostendendo uitam aeternam in quo delectentur, ostendendo incendium sempiternum in quo terreantur, ut a peccatorum delectationibus reuocentur.” Antecedit, inquam, quotidie gratia uoluntates nostras, sed nostra, quod est peius, uoluntas non sequitur. Inde est quod flemus orantes, gemimus paenitentes, quia antecedentem non sequimur, inuitantem contemnimus, et neque blandientem patrem ut filii honoramus, neque terrentem dominum timemus ut serui. Vnde etiam ipse ad nos deus loquitur per prophetam: *filius honorat patrem, et seruus timet dominum. Si dominus ego sum, ubi est timor meus? Si pater, ubi est honor meus?*

Interrogemus nunc. Aliquid exigit a nobis antecedens gratia, an non exigit? Procul dubio exigit. Quid exigit? Hoc utique quod ipsi dicitis, uoluntatem ipsam. Ergo antecedit gratia. Quid est gratia? Vt quod petieris, gratis accipias. Et ideo non dixit: “emite et dabitur uobis,” sed “petite et dabitur uobis.” Et ut apertius fratrum simplicitas hunc sensum agnoscat aliquam similitudinem afferamus. Ostensa est Salomoni sapientia: ecce gratia. Quid nunc dicat cui ostensa est, ipsum Salomonem loquentem ausulta: *amator, inquit, factus sum formae eius, et hanc quae sui assumere mihi, et currebam post eam, eo magis illa elongabat a me.*

on those who remain silent. Unless the secret of one' mind was declared with words, it will not help that person to attain grace. *For one believes with the heart and so is justified, and one confesses with the mouth and so is saved.*<sup>142</sup> Since the Lord says: *For everyone who asks receives*, it seems that the will of the person who asks comes first, so that the grace of the retributing God may be granted to those who ask. And in order that I may not appear to have left you in doubt concerning this passage, you who attribute everything to grace and who do not agree with me, hear me out when I say that not only I claim that grace comes first, but also that God does not disdain to reach out to people and to come to us, who had not asked. So, until now, the will of God has preceded the will of human beings. He wants us to be saved, but we do not want to. Woe to me and to the likes of me, because grace, the invitation and the will of God, repentance, the promise of eternal life, and the fear of eternal punishment – all these things precede our will, every day. Thus, every day the will of God, which is filled with countless mercies, precedes our will. However, our will does not strive after all these gifts of God.

23. What does your book say?

The will of God precedes the will of human beings.

And what did I say? That it both precedes and follows. This is what I have tried to argue, because you say that grace only precedes, but deny that it follows the human will. For the same reason you say that it comes first you also say that a person caught in the snares of sin may quiet their will and wait for the prevenient grace to come to them, so that their will may not come before God's grace. But we, who are Catholics, deplore this way of thinking and say: "Grace precedes the human will," pointing to the eternal life in which people rejoice and to the eternal fire of which they are terrified, so that they may be called away from the pleasures of sin. As I said, grace precedes our will every day; but, alas, our will does not follow. This is why we cry during prayer and moan as we do penance, because we do not follow the preceding grace, we ignore it as it calls out to us, and do not honor as dutiful children a loving father, and do not fear as servants a fearful master. Thus, God himself speaks to us through the prophet: *A son honors his father, and a servant fears his master; if, then, I am a father, where is the honor due to me?*<sup>143</sup>

Now, let me ask you something. Does prevenient grace demand something from us or not? Without a doubt, it does. What does it require? Especially what you say, namely the will itself. Thus, grace comes first. Why is grace given? So that you may freely receive what you ask for. Thus, Jesus did not say: "Get something, and it will be given unto you," but "Ask and it will be given unto you." In order that the simple mind of our brothers may grasp this thought more in depth, I intend to propose an analogy. The wisdom of Salomon has been shown to all. Here is grace; listen now from Solomon himself what he says to one to whom this wisdom is shown: *Her I loved and sought after from my youth; I sought to take her for my bride and was enamored of*

---

<sup>142</sup> Rom 10:10.

<sup>143</sup> Mal 1:6.

Non tibi uidetur pinxisse puellam pulcherrimam illicientem et prouocantem amatorem in cursu? Vt quid nunc uoluerimus huius exempli facere mentionem? Audite. Gratiam dei ponamus filiam patris. Hanc tibi, o homo, scias euidentibus indiciis a suo patre manifestatam, ut uideas et amator officiaris pulchritudinis eius. Ostendit etiam quantae sint eius diuitiae, quanta dilectio, quanta affabilitas, quanta fides. Est ergo pulchra, est diues, est fidelis, est sapiens, est etiam summi regis filia. Hanc tibi, o homo, ad hoc ante oculos tuos pater exhibuit, ut amator eius factus petas eam tibi in matrimonio, et ex ea deo filios facias, sicut fecit ille qui dicebat: *si decem milia paedagogorum habeatis in Christo, non tamen habebitis multos patres. Nam in Christo Iesu per euangelium ego uos genui.* De qua coniuge nos genuit Paulus deo? Vtique de gratia Christi, cuius amator factus uniuersa pro amore eius suauia habere se asserebat supplicia. Cape ergo a carnis exemplo comparationem puellae, ut ad sensum melius spiritalem attingas. Ergo est tibi ostensa puella a patre: ecce gratia patris antecessit uoluntatem. Iam tu incipe uelle. Ostensa utique gratia eius qui ostendit, ut quantum te amare credi debeat ex hoc consideres, quia ut te suum faceret, filiam suam tibi ostendit, pulchram, diuitem, sapientem, ad hoc ut amator eius effectus possis eam assumere tibi in matrimonio. Ecce gratia antecedens uoluntatem, ecce gratia stimulans pectus, ecce gratia illiciens mentem, ecce gratia excitans dormientem. Quid nunc iubebis ut faciat pater non petenti, non roganti, non concupiscenti, et calorem amoris tui non ostendenti? Tollit filiam suam, et iungit eam tibi fastidiis occupato aut aliis amoribus circumdato? Non hoc facit. Sed nisi quaesieris eam ut argentum, et nisi ut thesaurum uestigaueris eam, et nisi ex fide uolueris, et nisi ex fide cucurreris, et nisi tuam ueram dilectionem ostenderis, non eam omnino percipies. Sufficiat tibi, quia cum tu mendicus sis, et illa sit diues, suis te diuitiis locupletat. Degener tu, illa summi imperii filia, et sua te generositate nobilitat. Quid autem dicat pater eius amatoribus filiae suae sollicitus diligenter ausculta: *qui diligit, inquit, patrem et matrem plus quam me, non est me dignus.* Non dixit: “qui pauper est,” aut “qui degener,” aut “qui miser est,” sed “qui diligit aliquid aliud plus quam me, non est me dignus.”

O gratia antecedens uoluntatem, amorem solum flagitans! O homo, ama et accipe, sed, si amas, factis ostende. Omnis qui amat, uult, cupit, rogit, uigilat, currit, festinat, satagit per amicos, per notos, per familiares, per seruos, per se ipsum opportune, importune, obsecrationibus, promissionibus, fixo pacto, integroque amoris indicio. Et ut aperiam tibi oculos, tu qui te putas inuitum et nolentem gratiae diuinae posse sociari, quid est quod, quando eam dat pater, per familiares suos inquiritur ab eo qui

*her beauty.*<sup>144</sup> Doesn't she look to you like a most beautiful girl, seducing and teasing her lover on the road? Why do we now want to mention yet another example? Listen to what the grace of God looks like. Let us imagine a daughter. You man, you know her as she is described to you in flattering terms by her father, so that you may see her and fall in love with her beauty. Her father also shows you how wealthy, likeable, affable and faithful she is. She is beautiful, rich, faithful, wise and she is also the daughter of the Most-High King. The father showed the way she is before your eyes so that, falling in love with her, you may ask her hand in marriage and generate her children unto God, just like Paul did when he said: *Even if you should have countless guides to Christ, yet you do not have many fathers, for I became your father in Christ Jesus through the gospel.*<sup>145</sup> From what parent did Paul beget us unto God? Definitely, from the grace of Christ: having become its lover, he claimed that he regarded as sweet all the sufferings he endured for its sake. Therefore, take this comparison with a girl as a practical example in order to better draw out its spiritual implications. As I was saying, the girl was presented to you by her father. In this instance, the grace of the father preceded your will. But now you begin to want her. After the grace of the father has been shown, in order that you may appreciate how much he loves you (because in order to make you his own he showed you his daughter) he showed his beautiful, rich and wise daughter for this very reason, namely that after falling in love with her, you may take her in marriage. In this instance grace precedes the will; grace stirs the heart, seduces the heart and awakens one who is asleep. Now, what do you think the father should do with you, who do not ask, pray, yearn for his daughter and who do not show the warmth of your love? Will he take his daughter and give her to you, who are scornful or who are interested in other women? He certainly will not. Unless you seek her like you would seek silver or a treasure, and unless you want her out of faith, and hurry out of faith, showing her your true affection, most certainly you will never attain her. Let her be sufficient to you, because though you are poor and she is rich, she will supply you with wealth; though you are unworthy and she is the daughter of the Most High king, she will make you noble thanks to her generosity. Listen very carefully to what the Father says to those who court his daughter: *Whoever loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me.*<sup>146</sup> He did not say: "Whoever is poor, or worthless, or wretched," but: "Whoever loves anything more than me, is not worthy of me."

O blessed grace preceding the will, seeking only true love! Therefore, all of you, love and receive! But if you love, show it with deeds! Anybody who loves, wants, desires and prays, is vigilant, frets, hurries, exerts themselves with friends, acquaintances, relatives and servants in both an opportune and inopportune manner, with prayers, promises, with a formal agreement, and with the sign of a real love. And in order to open your eyes, considering that you believe that an unwilling and coerced person may be associated with divine grace, let me ask you this: why is it that when the father

---

<sup>144</sup> Wis 8:2.

<sup>145</sup> 1 Cor 4:15.

<sup>146</sup> Mt 10:37.

eam accipit, quomodo ueniat, si abrenuntiet omnibus amoribus mundi, omnibus pompis inimici, qui nisi uelle suum expresserit uerbis, numquid datur ei gratia quam poposcit? Quid ergo uult, quid cucurrit, quid desiderauit homo? Gratiam consequi. Et quid promittit? “Abrenuntio omnibus pompis diaboli et uoluptatibus eius.” Ostendit se nolle quod uoluit, et incipit uelle quod noluit. Et tunc iam gratiae participio incipit delectari, per quam et diues et regis filius nuncupetur. Ecce gratiam dei uobis et antecedentem et sequentem ostendimus. Antecedit, quia uocat, quia prouocat, quia inuitat ut uenias. Sequitur, quia dum ueneris, et uolueris, et petieris, donat. Videamus nunc quo uestra perget intentio.

24. [XVIII] Dicit enim anathemabilis liber a uestra uanitate conscriptus:

non enim cum rogaremus neque cum peteremus, sed *cum inimici essemus, reconciliati sumus deo*, non per nostram uoluntatem, sed *per mortem filii eius*.

Iubetis ergo ut non rogent homines deum ut reconcilientur ei, sed efficiantur inimici eius, ut possit stare apostoli Pauli sententia, neque uoluntatem suam bonis nisibus tradant, quia hoc quod reconciliantur homines deo, dicitis: “dixit nos apostolus reconciliari deo non per uoluntatem nostram, sed per mortem filii eius.” Ergo qui inimicus fuerit deo, ipse reconciliandus est deo, ipse saluandus secundum uos? Hi qui Christum crucifixerunt, hi saluandi sunt? Et qui dixerunt: “nolumus hunc,” ipsi sunt liberandi? Hi autem qui inimici non fuerunt, sed amici, et uoluerunt animam suam in amore eius ponere, hi erunt in execratione altissimo? Probatis uos omnibus haereticis acrius blasphemare, qui nolentes rectum tramitem ingredi, anfractibus uos plenis erroribus tradidistis. Non enim inimicitias nostras ad deum apostolus, sed caritatem inuitat. Dicit namque: *commendat itaque caritatem suam deus in nobis, quoniam si, cum inimici essemus, reconciliati sumus deo per mortem filii eius, multo magis reconciliati salui erimus ab ira per ipsum*. Commendat ergo hoc opere caritatem suam in nobis, ut uel sic amorem nostrum ei ex integro conferendo, uideamus saltem amoris uoto rependere quod uiribus non ualemus. Nam quod nos diligit deus, nobis prodest. Nos si diligimus deum, illi prodesse non possumus. Deus enim nullius eget, nullo honorante sublimatur, nullo contemnente deicitur. Ergo ut quid commendat caritatem suam in nobis? Vt dicamus utique: “si, cum inimici essemus, ita nos dilexit ut etiam unicum suum pro nostra omnium pateretur salute interfici, quanto magis nunc iam reconciliatos sibi saluos faciet in uitam ipsius?” Vnde excludens uestram specialem defensionem, generalem gratiam introduxit

gives her away, what is asked of him who receives her in marriage is the reason why he came, and whether he forsook all other loves of the world and all the glamour of the enemy? Unless he openly expressed his desire, will he be given the grace which he requested? What did he want, what did he run after, what did man desire? To attain grace. And what did he promise? To renounce all the glamour of the devil and of his lures. He showed he did not want what he wanted and began to want what he didn't want; and at that point he began to rejoice in the sharing of grace through which the riches and the king's Son are proclaimed. Thus, we have shown you how the grace of God both precedes and follows the human will. It precedes it, because it calls you, cajoles you, invites you to come. It also follows it, because when you come, want, and ask, it offers itself to you. Let us now see where you are going from here.

24. For your book, written by your vanity and worthy of anathema, says: The apostle does not say “we were reconciled to God” when we pray, but *when we were enemies*; and again, not through our own will, but *through the death of his Son*.

In conclusion, you encourage people not to pray to God in order to be reconciled with him but in order that they may be made his enemies, so that the apostle Paul's statement may be confirmed; you also tell people not to direct their will to good efforts because, since whenever people are reconciled to God, you say: “The apostle told us to be reconciled to God not through our own will, but through the death of his Son.” Thus, according to you, must one who was an enemy of God be reconciled with him and be saved? Do you conclude that these people who crucified Christ must be saved, and that those who said: “We do not want to be reconciled,” must be freed? Conversely, will those who were not God's enemies but his friends, and who resolved to entrust their souls to his love be cursed by the Most High? By saying this, you blaspheme God worse than all other heretics. Being unwilling to enter the right path, you have entrusted yourselves to arguments filled with errors. For the apostle does not excite our hostility toward God, but our charity. For he said: *Indeed, if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, how much more, once reconciled, will we be saved by his life.*<sup>147</sup> Therefore, he entrusts his love to us, so that, by addressing our love to him, we may at least acquire with a desire to love what we are not able to attain through our unaided effort. In fact, since God loved us, he benefits us. However, if we love God we cannot be a benefit to him. God does not need anyone. He does not increase because somebody tributes him honor; nor is he lessened if someone holds him in little account. So, why does he commend his love in us? So that we may say: “If he loved so much, though we were his enemies, to the point that he allowed himself to be killed for our salvation, how much more now that we are already reconciled to him, he will save us in the life of his Son.” Thus, the apostle, rejecting your particular interpretation, upheld universal grace by saying:

---

<sup>147</sup> Rom 5:10,11.

*dicens: considerantes hoc quod unus pro omnibus mortuus est, et adiecit: ergo omnes mortui sunt, quia pro omnibus mortuus est, ut et qui uiuunt, iam non sibi uiuant, sed ei qui pro omnibus mortuus est.*

25. [XIX] Occurrit nobis hoc loco insanus liber uester et dicit: uos, inquit, ubicumque *omnes* legit, generaliter uultis intelligi, cum *omnes* saepe pro parte doceantur. Nam cum dicitur: *omnes declinauerunt*, non tamen omnes declinauerunt. Et: *omnis homo mendax*, non tamen omnis homo mendax, quia legimus de quodam: erat homo uerax. Pars ergo maxima *omnes* uidetur significare, cum utique constet non omnes intelligi.

Nullum in libro uestro locum sine blasphemis inuenimus. Haec assertio ubi attendit? Vt consentientes uobis dicant Christum non pro omnibus passum. Si hoc non uultis intellegi, ergo non pro parte hoc loco apostolus nominauit *omnes*, sed omnes generaliter memorauit. Corrigite ergo librum uestrum, quia Christus pro omnibus passus est, omnibus hominibus subuenire festinat. Omnes uocat, omnes inuitat. Qui saluatus fuerit, imputabit gratiae dei uocanti inuitanti succurrenti, qui non saluatus fuerit, imputabit sibi negligenti contemnenti pariter et deserenti. Omnia enim bona nobis a domini gratia conferuntur petentibus, omnia autem mala a diabolo nobis deum contemnentibus irrogantur. Non enim poterit potestatem suam exercere diabolus in his qui diuinis defensionibus uiuunt. Numquid potest sibi subicere uictoris sui uasa captiuus? *Nemo*, inquit dominus, *intrat in domum fortis, et uasa eius diripiet, nisi prius fortem ligauerit, et tunc uasa eius diripiet*. Fortem uos ponitis inimicum, sed nos religatum et crucis tropaeo credimus esse subiectum, insidiosum, sed insidias eius detectas ostendimus. Numquid signo uictoriae munitum contingere praeualeat uictus? Numquid scuto domini circumdatum, et lorica fidei indutum, et galea spei et salutis munitum, ictus possunt inuadere sagittarum? Non uincitur a diabolo homo, nisi quando a suo recesserit defensore dicente apostolo: *subditi estote deo, resistite autem diabolo, et fugiet a uobis*. Inuisibilis hostis est, ab inuisibili defensore prosternitur. Sed contradicit hic etiam liber uester insanus, et ausus est dicere tantum diabolum posse, ut homines trahat inuitos, etiam hos quos Christus suo cruento redimens deo filios fecit.

*We have come to the conviction that one died for all; therefore, all have died. He indeed died for all, so that those who live might no longer live for themselves but for him who for their sake died and was raised.*<sup>148</sup>

25. Your senseless book opposes us on this point and claims:

Whenever you read the word “all,” you want to understand it in a general sense, when in reality “all” often refers only to a part. In fact, when we read: *All have gone astray*, that is not literally true. It is said: *All men are liars*; however, that is not the case, since we read about Nathaniel: *Here is a true Israelite. There is no duplicity in him*. Thus, it seems that “all” refers to the greatest part, since it is obvious that the term must not be understood as “every single person.”

We have not found a single part in your book that does not contain blasphemies. These last sentences are no exception. What is this last statement of yours aiming at? It tries to make those who agree with you say that Christ did not suffer for everybody. If you do not want to understand this, it follows that the apostle did not say “all” in this text meaning “a part,” but that he used this word in a general sense. Therefore, you need to correct your book, since Christ suffered for everybody and he hastens to come to everybody’s aid. He calls everybody and invites everybody. Whoever will be saved shall attribute it to the calling, inviting and helping grace of God. Whoever will not be saved must attribute it to their own negligent, spiteful and indifferent self. In fact, all good things are given to us by the grace of the Lord when we beseech him; but all kinds of evil things are inflicted on us by the devil when we despise God. For the devil will not be able to exercise his power over those who go through life surrounded by God’s protection. Can a prisoner freely dispose of the property of his conqueror? The Lord said: *How can anyone enter a strong man’s house and steal his property, unless he first ties up the strong man? Then he can plunder his house.*<sup>149</sup> You envision a strong enemy; but we believe that the enemy is bound and subject to the triumph of the cross. Though he is still treacherous, we point out the deceptions of his that have been unmasked. Can a vanquished person overcome a person marked with the sign of victory? Can arrows pierce one who is protected with the shield of the Lord, who donned the breastplate of faith, and who has been supplied with the helmet of hope and salvation? People are defeated by the devil only when they wander away from their protector, considering what the apostle says: *So submit yourselves to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.*<sup>150</sup> The enemy is invisible, but he is knocked down by an invisible defender. But here too, your foolish book contradicts us and dares to say that the devil has so much power that he can draw people unto himself against their will, including those whom Christ, who has redeemed them for God with his own blood, has turned into children of God.

---

<sup>148</sup> 2 Cor 5:14,15.

<sup>149</sup> Mt 12:29.

<sup>150</sup> Jas 4:7.

## 26. [XX] Dicitis enim:

clausis oculis transitis hostis insidias uos qui dicitis uoluntatem hominis aliquid posse uirtutis acquirere, non attendentes quanta damna deus quotidie patiatur, quantae ruinae castitatis per diabolum fiant, quantaeque criminum concupiscentiae. Quae utique si uideretis, non laboraremus uobis ostendere damna uirtutum et uictorias uitiorum.

Dicite, obsecro, damna quae deus quotidie patitur, diabolo uincente haec patitur, an homine contemnente? Si diabolo uincente dicatis, blasphemia uestra in caput uestrum refundimus, si homine contemnente, assertio nostra uictoriam cepit. Diabolus enim nec dominus, nec creator, nec pater est. Deus autem nobis et dominus et creator et pater esse dignatur. Corpus suum uictoriosissimum nostro corpori sociauit ut corporis nostri fragilitatem excluderet. Sanguinem suum nostro sanguini miscuit, ut feroe genuini caloris quiesceret diuino sanguine temperatus. Chrismatis sui uirtute nos unxit, ut luctantem contra nos diabolum uinceremus. Scuto bonae uoluntatis suae nos sese protegere repromittit: *qui sperat, inquit, in me, ego liberabo eum, protegam eum, quia cognovit nomen meum.* Vnde et superius ait propheta de eo: *qui habitat in adiutorio altissimi, quod non eum possit inuadere nec sagitta quae uolat per diem, nec negotium quod perambulat in tenebris, nec ruina aut daemonium meridianum, et cetera.* Vnde his indicis declaratur diabolus tunc habere uirtutem, cum nos inuenerit negligentes, cum nos inuenerit dormientes in fide. *Omnis enim qui ex fide inuocauerit nomen domini, hic saluus erit.* Verum quid prodest, quod humanum genus ostendimus per dei uictoriam a diabolo liberari, et suo uitio homines capi? Additur nobis alter oppositionis articulus.

## 27. [XXIV] Dicit enim liber eorum:

per praeuariationem primi hominis periit ab hominibus libertas arbitrii.

Nos autem dicimus: “per praeuariationem primi hominis, manifestata est libertas arbitrii, quae potuit hominem facere uelle quod deus non uult.” Si ergo periit libertas arbitrii, unde sumus homines peccatores? Aliunde non sumus peccatores, nisi quia uolumus quod deus non uult, et nolumus quod deus uult. Committimus quod fieri prohibet, et facere nolumus quod

## 26. For you say:

With closed eyes you fall into the traps of the enemy, you who claim that a person's will is able to accomplish something virtuous. You do not realize how many lapses in chastity occur because of the devil, and how many sins of lust, avarice, envy and treachery are committed every day. If you saw things the way they really are, we would not endeavor to show you the defeats suffered by virtues and the victories of vices.

Tell me, I beg you, what kind of damage does God suffer every day? Does he suffer these things because the devil is winning or because human beings are spiteful? If you say because the devil is winning, we hold you responsible for these blasphemies. If you say because human beings are spiteful, then our claim is vindicated. For the devil is neither lord, creator nor father. But God considered it worthy to be our lord, creator and father. He associated his most victorious body to ours in order to overpower the frailty of our body. He mixed his blood with ours so that our inner heat may be tempered by the divine blood. He anointed us with the virtue of his chrism, so that we may be able to defeat the devil as he fights against us. He promised in return to protect us with the shield of his good will: *Because he clings to me I will deliver him; because he knows my name I will set him on high.*<sup>151</sup> Here, as well as beforehand, the prophet said about that person: *You who dwell in the shelter of the Most High*<sup>152</sup> cannot be affected by the arrow that flies by day, nor by a threat that looms in the darkness, nor by a disaster, or by the scorching midday sun or other things.<sup>153</sup> Hence, the devil is said to have power in these two following instances: when he finds us negligent or asleep in the faith. Paul said: *"For everyone who – out of faith – calls on the name of the Lord will be saved."*<sup>154</sup> How does this really matter, if we show that humankind is freed from the devil by God's victory, but that human beings are trapped in their own vices? And yet another objection is adduced against us.

## 27. For their book says:

Freedom of the will disappeared from human beings through the transgression of the first man.

However, we say that through the transgression of the first man, freedom of choice has been manifested. Such freedom enabled people to want something contrary to God's wishes. Therefore, if the freedom of choice was lost, how can we human beings be sinners? In truth, we are sinners for no other reason that we want what God doesn't want and do not want what God wants. We have done what God forbade us to do and

---

<sup>151</sup> Ps 91:14.

<sup>152</sup> Ps 91:1.

<sup>153</sup> Ps 91:5,6.

<sup>154</sup> Rom 10:13.

praecepit adimpleri. Per quid hoc tantum mali facimus, si nolentes haec facimus? Alius est qui per nos operatur? Ipsi ergo debuit lex dari, non mihi. Non lex gladio datur, ne occidat hominem, sed illi datur lex, qui per gladium iugulat. Gladius enim siue occidat, siue non occidat, idem est: nec laudem enim quiescendo acquirit, nec occidendo culpam incurrit. Si ergo et nos agimur, non agimus, exclusi sumus a peccatis dum delinquimus, exclusi sumus a fide dum credimus. Hinc itaque superati ad calumniam conuertuntur.

28. [XXV] Ait enim liber eorum:  
haeresim Pelagianam iterum renouatis, cum dicitis per libertatem arbitrii homines finem ponere posse peccatis.

Pelagium non hinc condemnauit ecclesia. Obiecit enim ei quod in tantum exaggerasset libertatem arbitrii ut dei adiutorium recusaret. Nos autem dicimus: “per libertatem arbitrii peccatum omne committimus, ab omni autem peccato per dei gratiam liberamur consensu arbitrii.” Deum autem gratiam suam non potentibus non dare, ex isto loco docuimus quo ipse ait: *petite et accipietis*. Ostensum est nobis non potentibus quid petamus. Ostensum est nobis non quaerentibus quid quaeramus. Ostensum est nobis non pulsantibus quid pulsemus. Si noluerimus petere, non accipiemus, si noluerimus quaerere, non inueniemus. Si noluerimus pulsare, non aperietur nobis. *Omnis enim qui petit accipit, et qui quaerit inuenit, et pulsanti aperietur*. Libertas itaque arbitrii tam integra tamque perfecta est ut etiam ipsum deum possit contemnere a quo ipsa libertas est data. Quae utique ad hoc data est, ut de ea solus diabolus contemneretur. Si enim cessasset libertas arbitrii per praeuaricationem primi hominis, cessasset utique lex, quae non potest loqui nisi illi qui eam potest et contemnere et audire. Sed non cessauit lex, siue naturalis, per quam placuit Abel, Enoch, Noe, Sem et Iaphet, Melchisedech, Abraham, Isaac, Iacob, Ioseph, et ceteri hi placuerunt legis utique naturalis instinctu. Econtra displicuerunt, siue hi quos diluuii Charybdis biberunt, siue hi quos sulfurea flamma consumpsit. Nec illi enim placuerant nec isti displicuerant, si lex naturalis non exstitisset, et libertas in eis arbitrii non fuisset. Quid ergo agimus? Calumniam non euadimus, nisi dei solam gratiam dixerimus.

refuse to do what he instructed us to carry out. For what reason do we commit such great evil, if, even though unwillingly, we do these things? It is another person who works through us; the Law must be given to such person, not to me. The precept not to kill a human being is not given to a sword; rather, it is given to the one who slays with the sword. The sword, in fact, whether it kills or not, remains the same; it does not gain praise by remaining inactive, nor does it incur guilt by killing. Thus, if we are acted upon we do not really act; we are excluded from sins when we do wrong and we are excluded from the merit of having faith when we believe. At this point, after being defeated by our argument, our opponents resort to lies.

28. For their book says:

You revive again the Pelagian heresy when you say that through the freedom of the will human beings can put an end to their sins.

However, this is not why the Church condemned Pelagius, for it was objected to him that he had exaggerated the freedom of will so much as to deny the need for God's help. On the contrary, we say that we commit every type of sin through the freedom of choice and that we are freed from every sin through the grace of God with the consent of the will. We also teach from this text that God does not give his grace to those who do not ask for it, for Jesus said: *Ask and you will receive.*<sup>155</sup> What to ask for is shown to us who do not ask; what to seek after is shown to us who do not seek; what to knock for is shown to us who do not knock. If we do not want to ask, we do not receive; if we do not want to seek, we do not find; if we do not want to knock, it is not opened to us: *For everyone who asks, receives; and the one who seeks, finds; and to the one who knocks, the door will be opened.*<sup>156</sup> Therefore, the freedom of the will is strong enough in us as to enable us to obey God. However, it has been weakened in us as to despise God himself from whom this freedom comes. This freedom has been given to us especially for this reason, so that by acting through it the devil may be despised. If the freedom of the will had ended through the transgression of the first man, the Law too would have come to an end since the latter cannot address anyone else other than one who is able to either despise it or heed to it. But the Law, or natural law did not disappear. Through it, Abel, Enoch, Noah, Sem and Japhet, Melkisedek, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and others were found acceptable to God. These people were found acceptable due to the promptings of natural law. On the contrary, those who drowned in the flood and those who were consumed by the sulfurous flames were not found acceptable to God. But if natural law had not existed and if they did not have freedom of choice, the former would not be acceptable, nor the latter unacceptable to God. What should we do? We would not escape blame unless we talked about God's grace alone.

---

<sup>155</sup> Jn 16:24.

<sup>156</sup> Mt 7:8.

29. [XXIII] Latrat enim liber eorum dicens:  
 excluditis gratiam per libertatem arbitrii. Aut enim libero  
 arbitrio liberamur, aut gratia dei eripimur. Eligite quid dicatis.  
 Si gratiae totum datis, unum sumus, si libero arbitrio, sciatis  
 nos uobis consentire non posse.

Audite, calumniosi, et hoc quod timetis audite. Nos liberum  
 arbitrium ibi dicimus esse, ubi gratia diuina consistit. Sine gratia  
 enim dei non est liberum, sed captiuum arbitrium. *Vbi enim  
 spiritus domini, ibi libertas.* Nos libertatem istam non hominis  
 superbiae tradimus, sed gratiae dei et eius gloriae definimus, quae  
 tantum concedit ut plus faciant alii quam praecepit bonum, ex  
 quo etiam plus faciant alii quam prohibet malum. Manus enim  
 quae expoliare potest uestitum quod prohibet deus, haec uestire  
 potest nudum quod praecepit deus. Quid tu dicis? Vna manus  
 est quae nudum uestiuit, et quae uestitum exuit. Culpatur cum  
 exspoliauit, quia uestire potuit. Laudatur cum uestiuit, quia potuit  
 denudare. Tolle utriusque rei arbitrium liberum, et neque uitio  
 culpam incurrit, neque ex uirtute laudem acquirit.

Vt autem dispungam tibi libertatem arbitrii, arbitrium  
 in anima est, libertas in corpore. Libertas sine arbitrio non  
 peccat, cum arbitrium sine libertate delinquit. Denique si  
 aliquem furem tenueris clausum, libertatem ei furandi detulisti,  
 arbitrium non tulisti. Manus enim eius ligasti, non mentem. Si  
 caecus fiat aliquis, cum esset concupiscentiis deditus oculorum,  
 libertas quidem oculorum eius est uinta, arbitrium in suo iure  
 permanxit. Animi enim arbitratu concupiscentiis exercetur.  
 Vnde et non moechantem moechum Christus appellat eum  
 qui ad concupiscentium uiderit mulierem. Arbitrium enim  
 habet, licet non habeat libertatem. Fit per arbitrium suum  
 sine facto reus. Voluntas enim perfecta pro facti opere a iusto  
 iudice reputatur, et implesse dicitur omnia, qui quod potuit  
 fecit. Corpus enim prohibetur ab impossibilitate eius rei, qua  
 arbitrium animi non tenetur. Nunc ergo quid facit gratia? Non  
 tollit liberum arbitrium, sed curat, sed amplificat, sed ornat, sed  
 instruit et exaltat. Non tamen nolentem se, sed uolentem exaltat.  
 Nisi enim ex fide uolueris, et ex fide cucurreris, aliter a gratia  
 liberari non poteris. Certi ergo efficiamur, quod nos gratia non  
 recusat dum delinquimus, sed nos recusamus gratiam quando  
 peccamus. Vnum enim hic e duobus censura iudicantis attendit,  
 aut gratiam recusantem aut hominem contemnentem. Si enim  
 gratia recusauit, hominem a peccato liberum fecit. Numquid  
 culpandus est qui non prandit apud eum qui eum a suo conuiuio

29. But their book “barks” in this fashion:

As a matter of fact, you exclude grace through freedom of will. For either we are liberated through free will or we are rescued by God’s grace. Make up your minds: which is it? If you give everything to grace, we share a common view; but if you stake it all on free will, just know that we cannot agree with you.

Listen up, you liars and pay attention to what you ultimately fear! We say that free will exists where divine grace is firmly rooted. In fact, without the grace of God the human will is not free, but captive. *Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom.*<sup>157</sup> We do not attribute this freedom to human pride, but instead we limit it to the grace of God and to his glory. This grace stepped aside just enough so that those to whom it ordered to do good may do even more and those to whom it forbade evil may do the same. The hand that can strip the clothes despite God’s prohibition can also dress a naked person as God orders. But what do you say? It is the same hand that dressed the naked and undressed a clothed person; it is blamed when it undressed someone because it had the power to dress; it is praised when it dressed someone because it had the power to undress. But if you take away the freedom of choice of both, it will not incur blame for its vice nor receive praise for its virtue.

But allow me to make a further distinction in regard to the freedom of the will: the power of choice resides in the soul, while the freedom of action lies in the body. Freedom does not sin without the will, though the will can sin without freedom. What I mean is that if you keep a thief under lock you have taken away their freedom to steal but not their will, since you have tied up their hands but not their minds. If someone becomes blind, having been subjected to the lust of the eyes, the freedom of their eyes has been lost but the will still remains in their power; it is through the choice of their mind that they are still troubled by lust. Thus, Christ calls a person “adulterous” even when they are not committing adultery, but just for looking lustfully at somebody;<sup>158</sup> since that person has the will, it is not necessary for them to have freedom of action in order to sin. A person is guilty through their own will, even if they do not commit an evil deed. A just judge considers a person’s will to be sufficient for committing a deed. And a person who did what they could, is said to have committed all things. For the body is limited by the impossibility of doing certain things, but the will of the soul does not know such limitations. Therefore, what does grace do? It does not abolish free will but rather cures it, increases it, makes it fit, instructs it and stirs it. However, it does not stir an unwilling, but rather a willing person. For unless you want out of faith, and cooperate out of faith, you will not be able to be freed by grace. Therefore, let us be assured that grace does not refuse us when we sin, but that we refuse grace when we sin. The verdict of a judge comes down in favor of either one of these two possibilities: a grace that refuses us, or a person who is spiteful. For if grace refused us, it made people free of the guilt of sin. Should we blame a person who did not eat at another person’s home if the latter

---

<sup>157</sup> 2 Cor 3:17.

<sup>158</sup> Mt 5:28.

recusauerit, et non potius miseratioне dignus ostenditur, cum alios uocauerit et hunc recusauerit? Immanis crudelitas est, si prohibitus est prandere cum prandentibus, et cur non pranderit, ab eo qui eum simul prandere noluerit iubeatur occidi.

30. [XXIV] Tandem aliquando liber uester uanus effectus concedere uidetur libertatem arbitrii, ea tamen conditione ut de mensuris agat, non de specie:

Vnde, inquit, illi maior libertas arbitrii in bono, unde isti minor est, nisi quia dei dispensatione censemur? In alio enim tenuem se exhibet gratia, in alio abundantem et largam, prout ipsa uult, non prout nos uolumus.

Non te cum hic ego concertor. Hic te enim et Christus uincit et Paulus. Nam Christus dicit: *qui plus diligit, plus illi dimittitur, qui minus diligit, minus.* Et Paulus asserit dicens: *qui parce seminat, parce metet.* Non ergo est gratia per personarum acceptionem in deo, sed per hominis dilectionem in mente, siue sit magna dilectio, siue sit parua. Quis enim plus diligens deum, minus diligatur a deo? Immo, ut uerius dicam, non diligens deum a deo diligitur et parum diligens deum multum diligitur. Qualiter autem diligi deus possit, ipse dominus edocet dicens: *qui audit uerba mea et facit ea, hic est qui diligit me.* Vnde et discipulis suis ait: *si diligitis me, praecepta mea seruate.* Videamus itaque, homo, ipsam libertatem arbitrii quid faciat, ut dei gratiam perfecte conquerat. Exinanit libertatem suam et seruum se efficit dei. Quod autem nostro haec arbitrio faciamus, ipse apostolus edocet dicens: *nescitis quia cui uos seruos exhibetis ad oboediendum, serui estis eius cui oboeditis, siue iniquitatis ad peccatum siue iustitiae ad sanctificationem?* Qui ergo se sub iugum miserit dei, exinanuit sui libertatem arbitrii ut per libertatem diuini arbitrii liberetur. Non tibi uidetur exinanire libertatem arbitrii sui, qui sibi esurienti denegat panem, simenti denegat potum, dormitanti denegat somnum? Sed in his dignus esse non poterit, nisi se uoluntarium comprobauerit. *Non enim ex tristitia, inquit apostolus, nec ex necessitate. Hilarem enim datorem diligit deus.* Vnde et propheta dicit deo: *uoluntarie sacrificabo tibi.* Et iterum: *refloruit, inquit, caro mea, et ex uoluntate mea confitebor illi.* De iniusto autem legimus: *noluit intelligere ut bene ageret.* Vnde et beatus Iacob: *Simeon, inquit, et Leui fratres consummauerunt iniquitatem ex uoluntate sua.*

did not invite them? Rather, shouldn't such a person be commiserated, when the host invites other people but rejects them? It would be an incredible cruelty if that person was forbidden to join the party and then ordered to be killed by the same host who did not want to invite them to dinner in the first place.

30. Finally, your book, a worthless work, seems to uphold the freedom of the will at this condition, that it may act from a quantitative rather than a qualitative point of view:

Where does the greater freedom of will in doing good come, and where does the smaller part come from, unless it is deemed so by God's providential apportioning? In one person grace appears to be small, in another person abundant and far-reaching, according to what grace itself sees fit, and not according to our wishes as we are human beings who fell from the state of our original nature.

It is not I who is fighting you on this matter, since both Christ and Paul have already defeated you. For Christ says: "The more one loves, the more one's sins will be forgiven;" (n) and Paul claimed: *Whoever sows sparingly will also reap sparingly.*<sup>159</sup> Therefore, in God grace does not exist through favoritism but through a person's love in the mind, whether this love is great or little. Is there a person who the more loves God, the less is loved by him? On the contrary, to be exact, one who does not love God is still loved by him. In what way can God be loved, the Lord Jesus himself teaches us when he says: *Whoever has my commandments and observes them is the one who loves me.*<sup>160</sup> Hence, he told his disciples: *If you love me, you will keep my commandments.*<sup>161</sup> As we can see, a person is empowered by the freedom of the will so that they may attain the grace of God in a perfect way. Jesus relinquished his freedom and became a servant of God. What we do with our will, the Apostle himself teaches us, saying: "Don't you know that *just as you presented the parts of your bodies as slaves to impurity and to lawlessness for lawlessness, so now present them as slaves to righteousness for sanctification?*"<sup>162</sup> Therefore, whoever places himself under God's yoke surrenders their human free will in order to be freed through divine free will. Doesn't it look to you that one who denies themselves bread when they are hungry, drink when they are thirsty, and sleep when they are tired, have indeed surrendered their free will? But in undergoing these deprivations they should not have any merit unless they proved to be a willing subject. The Apostle said: *Each must do as already determined, without sadness or compulsion, for God loves a cheerful giver.*<sup>163</sup> Thus the psalmist says to God: "With a freewill offering I will sacrifice to you." And again: "I will believe in him out of my will." But about the unrighteous we read: *He has ceased to be wise and do good.*<sup>164</sup> Hence, blessed Jacob said about the brothers Simeon and Levi: "They did what was wrong out of their own will." (o)

<sup>159</sup> 2 Cor 9:6.

<sup>160</sup> Jn 14:21.

<sup>161</sup> Jn 14:15.

<sup>162</sup> Rom 6:19.

<sup>163</sup> 2 Cor 9:7.

<sup>164</sup> Ps 36:4.

Si ergo antequam uera et integra libertas nostra ueniret, dominus Iesus Christus, iustus uoluntarie sacrificauit deo, et ex uoluntate sua confessus est, peccator ex uoluntate deliquit, quanto magis nunc, instaurata nobis libertate per Christum, uniuersa nostro iure sunt redditia, non natura dominante, ut Pelagius et Caelestial definiuit, non natura hominis dominante, sed Christi gratia condonante, non suis uiribus imputando, sed de dei adminiculis praesumendo, non sibi aliquid usurpando, sed totum dei gratiae imputando? Totum, inquam, totum dixi, totum repeto, totum, sed bonum. Malum autem ex nostro uitio, ex nostra negligentia, et ex nostra incurrimus uoluntate. Quid conuertitis caput ad calumnias, et Pelagi nobis dogma obicitis? Anathemamus omnes qui dicunt, adiutorio dei sublato, posse hominem sine peccato esse, si uelit. Anathemamus qui dicunt: “nec per Adam mors, nec per Christum uita.” Anathemamus qui dicunt de duobus baptizatis qui nascitur baptismum indigere non posse. Anathemamus qui dicunt infantes non debere in remissionem peccatorum baptismatis sanctificatione censeri. Anathemamus omnia quae in omnibus haereticis damnat ecclesia.

31. [XXVIII] Anathemamus et librum uestrum uobis cum qui dicit:

in tantum uitiata per praeuaricationem Adae hominis naturam agnouimus, ut instaurationem suam per Christum non in re, sed in spe fuerit consecuta dicente apostolo: *spe salui facti sumus. Spes autem quae uidetur, non est spes.* Si ergo *spe salui facti sumus*, adhuc rem in praesenti saeculo non tenemus. Ideo denique baptizati iterum carnaliter concupiscunt, et illos motus corporis patiuntur, quia spe, non re consecuti sunt instaurationis auxilium. Si enim re consecuti fuissent, post baptismatis gratiam non esset peccati nec possibilitas nec uoluntas. Verum quia uirtus baptismatis tanta est ut uniuersa peccata deleat, pullulatio tamen peccatorum baptismatis unda non abluitur. Inesse enim per Adam naturaliter perdocetur. Nam illa membra quae in baptismatis hora confusione carent, postea confusionem recipiunt, qua euitant ubique conspectum, et quaerunt pudendo secretum. Quae enim deus membra fecerat, praeuaricatio in pudenda conuertit, et non dicuntur membra, sed pudenda. Quae pudenda in puncto illo baptismatis membra fiunt, sed mox iterum pudenda efficiuntur ex membris. Non enim re, sed spe instaurati sunt. Concupiscentia enim carnis, quae per praeuaricationem Adae regnat in corpore tamquam lex peccati, iterum sibi uindicat baptizatum, totumque animum eius conatur euertere. Haec est enim radix illius plagae, quam Christus saluauit. Saluauit autem sic, sicut apostolus dicit: *spe salui facti sumus.* Et iubet nos animum ad inuisibilia contemplanda

If our true and complete freedom came first, the just Lord Jesus Christ sacrificed voluntarily to God and believed out of his own will just as the sinner sinned acted out of his/her will. How much more now, as our freedom has been restored to us through Christ, all things have been restored to our power, not by the power of nature, as Pelagius and Caelestius envisioned, not by human beings dominating nature but by the forgiveness of Christ's grace; not by attributing it to one's strength, but by receiving the help of God; not by usurping anything to one's self, but by attributing everything to God's grace. I say "everything," let me repeat, "everything," as long as it is good. For what is evil comes from our vice and from our negligence, and we run into it of our own will. So, why do you misinterpret our argument and accuse us of following Pelagius' belief? We anathemize all those who say that a person can be without sin if they want to, without the help of God; we anathemize those who say that death does not come through Adam and that life does not come through Christ; we anathemize those who say that one who is born from two baptized parents does not need to be baptized; we anathemize those who say that infants must not be granted the sanctification of baptism for the forgiveness of sins; we anathemize all those views that the Church condemns in all the heretics.

31. We also anathemize you and your book which says:

We know that human nature has been corrupted due to Adam's transgression, so that its renewal will be accomplished through Christ not in reality, but in hope, as the apostle says: *For in hope we were saved. Now hope that sees for itself is not hope.* Therefore, if we have been saved in hope, we have not received salvation in this present time. This is the reason why the baptized covet again in their flesh and are subject to the stirrings of the flesh; for they have attained the help of divine renewal in hope, but not in actuality. For if those who have been baptized had really obtained this help, neither the possibility, nor the will to sin would continue to exist in them after receiving the grace of baptism. The truth is that, even though the virtue of baptism is so great as to take away all sins, nevertheless, the water of baptism does not flush away the ongoing sprouting of sin; its growth continues in human nature through Adam. Those members of the body that at the time of baptism are not acting in a disorderly fashion, later on in life undergo turmoil, for they shun public sight and seek privacy, as they feel ashamed. Those things that God made as body parts, sin has turned into shameful parts, so that they are no longer called 'members of the body' but *pudenda* (shameful parts). Those shameful parts at the time of baptism are made to be parts of the body, but soon enough shameful parts emerge from those members, since they were not removed in reality, but in hope. The concupiscence of the flesh that rules in the body just like the law of sin, because of Adam's transgression, once again reclaims the baptized person and endeavors to subvert his/her whole being. This concupiscence is the root of that plague that Christ healed, though he healed it in the way the apostle says: *In hope we were saved.* And he commands us to turn our minds to the contemplation of invisible things, and not to ruin our lives by making

transferre, nec de his quae uidentur praesumendo corruere. Et ideo dicit: *spes autem quae uidetur non est spes*, ne forte aestimarentur per baptismum ita tolli peccata ut etiam radices ipsae peccatorum simul putarentur auferri. Motus enim ille pollutionis, qui per praeuaricationem naturam inuasit, ita remanet in baptizato, sicut radix capilli, cum fuerit nouacula in superficie emundatus et rasus. Rasus enim est ut emundaretur locus, non est eradicator ut ulterius non nasceretur. Si enim ex integro per baptismum omnis praeuaricationis Adae fragilitas tolleretur, baptizati omnes nullo caloris motu traherentur ad crimina, nullus sordibus inquinaretur humanis, nullus concupiscentiae stimulo pungeretur, sed quia *spe salui facti sumus*, quod adhuc non uidemus, *per patientiam exspectamus*. Veniet tempus in quo neque nubant feminae, neque uiri uxores ducant, sed sint sicut angeli in caelis. *Cum enim corruptibile hoc induerit incorruptionem, et mortale hoc induerit immortalitatem, tunc fiet sermo qui scriptus est: absorpta est mors in uictoram. Vbi est, mors, uictoria tua? Vbi est stimulus tuus? Stimulus autem mortis peccatum est, uirtus uero peccati lex.* Tunc dicemus: *deo gratias, qui dedit nobis uictoram per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum.*

Hic est libellus uester, quem nulli datis legendum nisi sub sacramento. Vide ne prodas, ne des legendum imperitis: regnum dei paucorum est. In hoc apparet quia te deus praedestinavit ad uitam, si hunc libellum tu sicut tuam animam serues. Maxima pars mulierularum a uobis hunc merentur libellum accipere. Denique quae eum prodidit, femina corpore, sed uir animo, dum istum a uobis libellum sub sacramento suscepisset, scriptum legens exhorruit, et his quos catholicos nouerat examinandum dedit. Legimus eum et nos, quod semper timuistis, et iuante domino blasphemias eius euidenter detegentes, omnes catholicos admonemus ut hunc libellum fugiant, exsecentur, et aeterno anathemate feriant. Damnabilitas enim eius eo usque peruenit, ut uniuersa mysteria saluatoris euacuet. Dicit baptismum Christi fructum ullum penitus, dum traditur, non habere. *Spes, inquit, quae uidetur non est spes*, id est remissio peccatorum, et quidquid in praesenti promittitur, non est, quia in futuro seruatur. Hic tamen, id est in hoc mundo, non accipitur. Dicit enim apostolus: *spes quae uidetur non est spes*. Ergo ne hoc apostolus ad istum uestrum sensum dixit? Prius itaque beati Pauli cum debita reuerentia sensum exponemus, et ita demum per partes concidemus pedes libri uestri, in his quae conclusio eius circa nos finem se autumat inuenisse perfectum. Apostolus consolationem filiis dei afferens dicit ut in isto mundo nihil quaerant, ne forte, considerantes impios et incredulos prosperis successibus gratulari, se uero affligi, dicerent: *“ecce hi peccatores et abundantes in*

unwarranted assumptions about visible things. Thus, the apostle says: *Hope that is seen is not hope*. We should not think that sins are removed through baptism in such a way that even the roots of sin themselves are eradicated as well. In reality, the activity of corruption that crept into human nature as a consequence of the Fall, remains in the baptized person just as the root of a hair remains in the head when the latter is cleaned and shaven at the surface with a razor. The hair is shaven in order to clear an area of the head; however, it is not uprooted, and thus grows back again. For if the entire weakness of Adam's transgression had totally been removed through baptism, every baptized person would not be drawn to sin by experiencing arousal of passions; no one would be contaminated by human pollution; no one would be affected by the stirrings of lust. But since we are saved in hope, what we still do not see, we expect with patience. There comes a time when people will neither marry, nor be given in marriage, but be like angels in heaven. We read in the apostle's letter: *And when this which is corruptible clothes itself with incorruptibility and this which is mortal clothes itself with immortality, then the word that is written shall come about: "Death is swallowed up in victory. Where, O death, is your victory? Where, O death, is your sting? The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law."* Then, we will say: *But thanks be to God who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ*.

This is your little book, which you do not give anyone to read except under oath [of secrecy]. You take precautions not to give it to un-experienced people so that it may not benefit them. After all, you believe that the kingdom of God belongs to a few. In this book it appears that God predestined you to life considering that you care for this short book as you would care for your own soul. The great majority of mindless people deserve to receive from you this little book. However, the lady who gave us this book, a woman in body but endowed with a virile spirit, after she received it from you under oath, as she was reading it became alarmed and gave it to those whom she knew were orthodox Catholics for their perusal. We have read it among ourselves, which is what you always feared. With the help of God, having clearly detected the blasphemies it contains, we now warn all Catholics to shun this little book, encouraging them to execrate it and to condemn it with an eternal anathema. Its accursed nature has gone as far as to void all the mysteries of the Savior. It says that when baptism in the name of Christ is administered it does not have any far-reaching effect. It says that hope that is seen is not hope, that is, the remission of sins; and that anything that is promised in the present is not real because it is reserved for the future. This hope, they insist, is not to be attained in this life. For the Apostle says: *Hope that is seen is not hope*. Could the apostle possibly have meant what you mean? Therefore, let us expound with due reverence the meaning of blessed Paul's text; only in this manner we will be able to undermine your book's claims. The apostle, bringing to the children of God the divine consolation, exhorts them not to seek anything in this world so that, thinking that the impious and the unbelievers rejoice for their success, they may not say: *Such, then, are the wicked, always carefree,*

*saeculo obtainuerunt diuitias, nos autem usque in hac hora et esurimus et sitimus et nudi sumus et colaphis caedimus.*” Tollens ergo praesentis saeculi considerationem, gaudia futuri promittit. Et quamvis magnis, inquit, passionibus fatigemini, *non sunt tamen condignae passiones huius temporis ad futuram gloriam quae reuelabitur in nobis.* Et ideo *spe*, inquit, *salui facti sumus.* Nota tibi *salui facti*: non dixit “*saluandi*,” sed *salui facti*. Praeteritum fecit salutis: dum credidimus, *salui facti sumus.* Quare *spe*? Speramus enim nos resurgere. Non enim iam resurreximus. Quia ergo speramus nos pro bonis praemia accepturos, et pro malis gehennae posse incurrere suppicia, sperantes bona et timentes mala, *salui facti sumus*: et qui eramus filii irae, facti sumus filii dei. Vnde et alius apostolus clamat: *carissimi, filii dei sumus.* Non ergo adoptio filiorum promittitur in baptismō, sed confertur. Vos autem de hoc quod iam accepimus, dicitis: *spes quae uidetur non est spes.* Nobis spes tota uidetur in baptismatis sanctificatione constare. Ergo quod nobis uidetur spes non est spes. In chrismatis Christi unctione spei nostrae cernimus firmamentum. Ergo *spes quae uidetur non est spes.* Corpus Christi spem nostram uidemus. Ergo *spes quae uidetur non est spes.* Sanguinem Christi redemptionem nostram attendimus. Ergo *spes quae uidetur non est spes.* Euacuatis omnia sacramenta, exinanistis mysteria, et quasi fidi et idonei metatores antichristi, locum ei ubi possit succedere eiectis nobis ab aliquibus praeparatis. Nam haec quae apostolus de mundi istius gaudiis dicit: *spes quae uidetur non est spes*, uos ea ad diuina mysteria transmigrastis. Et quod ille de caducis rebus et labentibus memorat, hoc uos etiam ipsi sacro baptismati ascripsistis. Non habeamus partem uobis cum in aeternum, nec sensus noster ultra his blasphemias inquinetur.

32. [XXVI]:

Ideo, inquietunt, baptizati iterum polluuntur, et carnaliter concupiscunt, quia spe non re consecuti sunt instauracionis auxilium.

Nos autem sic spem tendimus ad futura praemia, ut praesenti quod accepimus non negemus. Non enim meretur consequi beneficia, qui non confitetur accepta. Si quod accepisti iam denegas, confutaris ingratus. Ergo si adhuc non estis gratiam consecuti, sed consecuturi estis, quid nobis cum clanculo communicatis? Exspectate alterum Christi corpus, alterum Christi sanguinem. Iustum enim non in re, sed in spe esse iactatis.

increasing their wealth;<sup>165</sup> while, on the contrary, *To this very hour we go hungry and thirsty, we are poorly clad and roughly treated.*<sup>166</sup> By diverting the attention from the care for this present time, he promised the joys awaiting us. And no matter how great the passions of this age that afflicts us, they are as nothing compared with the glory to be revealed for us.<sup>167</sup> This is why he said: *For in hope we were saved.*<sup>168</sup> Notice that he said: *were saved*, and not “will be saved.” He referred to salvation as a thing of the past; when we believed, we were saved. Why “in hope?” We hope to rise again, though we have not been raised yet. For we hope we will receive rewards for the good we have done and fear that we may incur the torments of hell for our evil deeds. Also, as we hope for good things and as we fear evil things, we were saved; and we, who were children of wrath, were made children of God.<sup>169</sup> Hence, another Apostle exclaims: *Beloved, we are God's children now.*<sup>170</sup> Thus, the adoption of children is not promised just in baptism, but really bestowed in it. But you say something that we already agree upon: “Hope that is seen is not hope.” It seems to us that our entire hope abides in the sanctification of baptism; therefore, that which seems to us to be hope is not hope. We recognize the foundation of our hope in the anointing of the chrism of Christ. Hence, hope that is seen is not hope. We see that the body of Christ is our hope; hence, hope that is seen is not hope. We think that the blood of Christ is our redemption; hence, hope that is seen is not hope. You have emptied all the sacraments and the mysteries, and almost like faithful and fit forerunners of the Antichrist, you prepare for him a place where he can replace us, once we, your opponents, are no longer around. In fact, those things that the Apostle said about the pleasures of this world, namely: *Now hope that sees for itself is not hope,*<sup>171</sup> you apply to the divine mysteries; that which he applied to ephemeral and transient things, you attribute to baptism itself. We will have no part with you in the next life, nor will our mind be further polluted by your blasphemies.

32. They say:

This is the reason why the baptized covet again in their flesh and are subject to the stirrings of the flesh; for they have attained the help of divine renewal in hope, but not in actuality.

But because of hope we look forward to future rewards in such a way as not to deny what we receive in the present. Anyone who does not cherish benefits does not deserve to receive them. If you already spurn what you received, you prove to be ungrateful. Therefore, if until now you have not received grace but will receive it in the future,

<sup>165</sup> Ps 73:12.

<sup>166</sup> 1 Cor 4:11.

<sup>167</sup> Rom 8:18.

<sup>168</sup> Rom 8:24.

<sup>169</sup> Eph 2:3.

<sup>170</sup> 1 Jn 3:2.

<sup>171</sup> Rom 8:24.

## 33. [XXVII]:

Si enim re, inquiunt, consecuti essemus, post baptismatis gratiam non esset peccati nec possibilitas nec uoluntas.

Ideo ergo uultis ostendere baptismatis gratiam non rem contulisse, quia iterum post baptismum possumus et uelle malum et operari malum. Et cui habeat dari lex dei, si possibilitas mali fuisset ablata? Aut quis de custodia mandatorum dei praemium peteret, si praeuaricari non posset, sicut nec mutus de taciturnitate, nec spado de uirginitate laudatur. Carent enim laude in bono, quibus ad malum transitus denegatur. Nos ergo dicimus possibilitatem mali bonam esse his qui eam contemnunt, et possilitatem boni malam esse his qui eam contemnunt. Dabo his singulis titulis breue responsum. Potuit quis expoliare uestitos: ecce malum potuit, sed quia noluit, facta est ei possilitas mali bona, qui eam consilio prudentiori contempsit. Potuit quis creditas pecunias rapere, potuit adulteria perpetrare: ecce possilitas mali. Et qui eam contempsit, ipsa possilitas eum fecit tam de pecunia non furata laudari, quam coronari de castitate seruata. Diximus unum titulum, id est de possilitate mali, quod bona sit his qui eam contempserint. Nunc uideamus quomodo e contrario possilitas boni mala sit his qui eam contempserint. Habet quispiam pecunias positas: ecce possilitas boni. Potest enim cunctis necessitatibus patientibus subuenire. Hanc autem possilitatem boni dum contempserit, efficitur possilitas mala, et tam mala ut radix malorum omnium comprobetur. Verum quid agimus? Baptismatis nobis status in periculo ponitur, et nos de auaritiae ueneno tractamus? Omnibus notum est auaritiae crimen satis esse grauissimum. Baptismatis autem gratiam exinaniri ab hominibus perfidis, nuper coepit innotescere, nuper coepit catholicis propalari.

## 34. [XXVIII] Aiunt namque per baptismum ita tolli peccatum ut capillum nouacula erasum:

Rasus enim est, inquiunt, ut emundaretur locus, non eradicatus est, ne ulterius nasceretur. Si enim ex integro omnis praeuaricationis Adae fragilitas tolleretur, baptizati omnes nullo caloris motu traherentur ad crimina, nullo concupiscentiae stimulo pungerentur.

Hinc ergo exinanitis baptismatis sacrosancta mysteria, quia concupiscentia, ut ipsi dicitis, lex peccati est, et ipsa sibi iterum

why do you argue with us? Wait, then, for another body and blood of Christ, since you brag that they are not received in reality, but in hope.

33. They say:

For if those who have been baptized had really obtained this help, neither the possibility nor the will to sin would continue to exist in them after receiving the grace of baptism.

It follows that you want to show that the grace of baptism did not refer to this case because we are capable of and indeed yearn for evil again and practice it too. And to whom was the Law supposed to be given if the possibility of evil had been removed? Or who would ask for a reward for keeping God's commandments if the same person was not capable of transgression? In the same way, a mute would be praised for his silence and a eunuch for his chastity. Those for whom backsliding is not a real possibility do not deserve praise for doing good. Consequently, we say that the possibility of doing evil is a good thing for those who despise it. I will give to these various reasons a brief response. Someone had the power to forcibly undress those who are well dressed. That person was capable of evil but since they did not want to do it the possibility of evil was turned into something good, since they despised evil and followed more prudent considerations. Another person could have kept borrowed money or committed adultery: here is the possibility of committing evil, but in the case of one who turned it down the same possibility made them worthy to be praised for not keeping the borrowed money and worthy to be crowned for remaining chaste. We have mentioned only one case; namely the possibility of evil which becomes good in the case of those who will despise it. Now, on the contrary, let us see in what way the possibility of good turns evil in the case of those who will despise it. Someone has money set aside. Here is the possibility of doing good, for they can take care of the needs of indigent people. As long as they despised this possibility, the possibility of doing evil is very real, as the root of all evil demonstrates. (p) What should we do? The condition of baptism [our state of baptized people] is jeopardized and we deal with the poison of avarice! Everybody knows that the sin of avarice is extremely serious; and yet the idea recently began to be known and circulate among Catholics that the grace of baptism is rendered void by evil people.

34. They say that through baptism sin is removed like hair is removed by a razor: The hair is shaven in order to clear an area of the head; however, it is not uprooted, and thus grows back again. For if the entire weakness of Adam's transgression had totally been removed through baptism, every baptized person would not be drawn to sin by experiencing arousal of passions; no one would be contaminated by human pollution; no one would be affected by the stirrings of lust.

This is where you begin to render void the holy mysteries of baptism, since concupiscence, as you yourselves say, is the law of sin and it reclaims for itself the

uindicat baptizatum. De hac ergo concupiscentia si fueritis exclusi, integra erit in baptismo et peccatorum remissio et uera collatio gratiarum. “Gratiarum” autem ideo pluraliter posui, quia, cum una sit gratia, ut uitis una palmitibus pluralis efficitur, et tot uites dicuntur, quot fuerint propagines de una uite compressae. Datur ergo ex uno baptismatis fonte in praesenti peccatorum remissio, et regnum promittitur in futuro, efficitur filius hominis filius dei, fit adoptione filius, fit consors regni, fit cuius ex aduena, fit ingenuus qui seruus extiterat inimici, fit locuples qui fuerat ante mendicus, et qui fuerat dudum ignobilis, incipit esse et illustris et magnus. Sed ista omnia euacuat liber uester, et dicit:

35. [XXIX]:

Si darentur quae promittuntur in baptismo, nullus post baptismatis undam concupiscentiae stimulo pungeretur.

Videamus ergo utrumnam haec concupiscentia, sicut dicitis, lex peccati sit. Nos concupiscentiam dicimus esse rem naturalis certaminis, et hanc dicimus ad propagationem hominum a deo creatore uisceraliter esse firmatam. Adhuc enim primi homines nondum de praeuaricationis ligno gustauerant, quando eos benedixit deus dicens: *crescite et multiplicamini, et replete terram.* Qui ergo ante peccatum benedicendo genus hominum multiplicari iussit, ipse sine dubio huic naturae per quod propagari posset inseruit. Dispar etenim sexus multiplicari minime potuisset, si crementa naturalis concupiscentiae non haberet. *Non est bonum, ait dominus, hominem solum: faciamus ei adiutorium.* Hoc adiutorium disparis sexus ad consolandum uultis esse factum a domino, an ad generandum? Si enim concupiscentia mala est quae materia generationis ostenditur, constat secundum uos a deo mulierem non ad adiutorium boni, sed ad occasionem factam esse peccati. Quod si adiutorium mulieris non ad reparationem, sed ad consolationem nescio quam dicatis fuisse concessum, dispar sexus sine causa est conditus ab eo, de quo legimus quod omnia in sapientia fecerit. Verum quia testamenti ueteris forte uos auctoritas non tenet, de primis hominibus quid ipse dominus noster Iesus Christus dixerit auscultate: *qui fecit, inquit, masculum et feminam benedixit eos et dixit: propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem, et adhaerebit uxori suae, et erunt duo in carne una.* Et his dictis adiunxit: *quod ergo deus iunxit, homo non separat.* A deo igitur factos, a deo benedictos, a deo legimus esse coniunctos.

baptized. If you were exempt from it, the remission of sins in baptism would be complete and the consolation of God's grace would be real. I posited a plurality of graces because though grace is one, like a vine, it grows into many branches. All of them, being tight ramifications stemming from the same one vine are collectively called "vine." Therefore, remission of sins is bestowed in the present from one baptismal font, and the kingdom is promised in the future. A human being is turned into a child of God; he/she becomes a child by adoption; he/she becomes a partaker in the kingdom. From being a foreigner, he/she becomes a citizen. One who lived as a slave of the enemy is freed; and one who a little earlier was worthless becomes great and noble. But your book voids all these things, as you say:

35. "If the things that are promised in baptism were actually given, no one, after the washing of baptism, would experience the pangs of concupiscence."

Let us see then if it is true that this concupiscence, as you claim, is the law of sin. We say that concupiscence is a matter of a natural struggle and that it has been established deep within human beings by our creator God for the propagation of the human species. Up to that time the first couple had not yet enjoyed the fruit from the tree of transgression when God blessed them saying: *Be fertile and multiply; fill the earth.*<sup>172</sup> He who, with his blessing, ordered the human species to reproduce even before original sin was committed, without a doubt is the same God who introduced concupiscence in this human nature so that it may reproduce itself. For human beings placed in this nature could have hardly multiplied unless they begat children born of natural concupiscence. What kind of help to the different sex do you expect to be made by God for consolation, if not to generate? For if concupiscence is evil, which is shown in the matter of generation, it follows that according to you woman was not made as a help for doing good, but as an opportunity to sin. For if the help of the woman was granted not for reparation but for consolation, the different sex would have been created without a reason by God, about whom we read that he made all things wisely. Since the authority of the Old Testament does not have a hold on you, at least listen to what our Lord Jesus Christ said about the first couple: "The Creator made them male and female and said, *For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh*"<sup>173</sup> And he also added: *Therefore, what God has joined together, no human being must separate.*<sup>174</sup> Thus, we read that man and woman were made, blessed and conjoined by God.

---

<sup>172</sup> Gen 1:28.

<sup>173</sup> Mt 19:4,5.

<sup>174</sup> Mt 19:6.

36. [XXX] Et miror qua fronte concupiscentiam istam, per quam coniugia celebrantur, dicatis a diabolo esse humanae generationi inflictam. Quis enim dubitet rem malam, si tamen mala est, a deo bono homini non potuisse conferri? Si enim a deo est data, bona esse dignoscitur. Si autem mala est, constat a diabolo esse infusam.

37. [XXXI] Sic enim dicit liber uester:  
quae deus membra fecit, illi praeuaricando pudenda fecerunt.

Si hoc non est in membris quod deus condidit, et super fabricam dei inimicus apparuit, et deo inuito fecit creaturam eius alterum ordinem continere, non quem ipse instituit, maledictae sunt nuptiae, et ex maledictione uniuersa humani generis massa ueniens diabolo auctore subsistit. Vnum uobis eligite e duobus: aut bona est generatio hominis, et bona est concupiscentia, aut malae sunt nuptiae, et iniqua concupiscentia. Emendate ergo ecclesiae regulam, damnate qui in toto orbe sunt sacerdotes nuptiarum initia benedicentes, consecrantes et in dei mysteriis sociantes. Miror qua fronte intratis ecclesiam, ubi quidquid agitur contra uestras sectas uenire cognoscitis. Negatis itaque deum hanc, unde nascimur, dedisse concupiscentiam. Ergo non sumus creatura eius, si non est creatura concupiscentia coniugalnis. Tollite enim hanc, quam uos dicitis legem esse peccati, et uideamus quis adhaerere possit uxori. Sed qui dederat uirtutem seminis in benedictionem, ipse ob multiplicandam sobolem concupiscentiae inseruit caritatem, et amari uoluit quod multiplicari constituit. Crementum est enim generis concupiscentia naturalis. Quod si per hanc, ut dicitis, esse constat omnis causa peccati, ipse crimen creauit in genere, qui posteritatem multiplicari uoluit per amorem, et super paternae pietatis iura diligi paecepit uxorem. Denique ipse dominus noster Iesus cum dicit: *quod deus iunxit, homo non separat*, tale est quasi qui diceret: “odisse tibi uxorem non licet, quam me auctore amare coepisti.” Zelabatur enim coniunctionem a se factam odiis iugalibus maculari.

O rerum noua peruersitas! Cum a deo puniatur uxorius odium, damnatur ab hominibus concupiscentia maritorum. Sed iustus iudex non damnat desiderium naturale, qui, ut multiplicaret prolem, ideo inseruit caritatem. Nam cum de coniugio et repudio tractaretur, tunc dominus istam dictauit sententiam dicens: *quod deus iunxit, homo non separat*. Hoc autem ideo dixit, ut specialiter nuptiarum coniunctionem ex deo esse monstraret. Nec enim esse potuit aut sine coniunctione commixtio aut absque commixtione coniunctio. Si non ex creatura factoris, sed ex peccato, inquiunt, concupiscentia maritalis, ergo secundum uos deus hoc in

36. I am amazed that in regard to this concupiscence, through which marriages are consummated, you say that it has been inflicted by the devil on humankind. Who doubts that an evil thing, if it is really evil, could not possibly have been given to the human race by a good God? For if it has been given by God, it should be reputed to be good; but if it is evil, it certainly has been instilled by the devil.

37. Your book says:

Those things that God made as body parts, sin has turned into shameful parts, so that they are no longer called “members of the body,” but “shameful parts.”

If concupiscence, which we believe was created by God himself, is not in the members; and if the enemy appeared over God’s creation and, going against God’s will, caused his creature to follow another norm, different from the one which God himself established – then it follows that marriage is a curse and that the entire mass of human beings, descending from a curse, is liable to damnation because of the devil. Choose one of the two: either the generation of human beings is a good thing, and in this case concupiscence is good too; or marriage is evil, and so is concupiscence. In the latter case, correct the Church’s rule and reproach the priests who bless the beginning of marriage, who consecrate couples and allow them to participate in God’s mysteries. I find it strange that you still come to Church, since you know that everything that takes place in it goes against your sect’s beliefs. Therefore, you deny that God has given human beings this concupiscence which caused us to be born in the first place. Thus, we are not really God’s creatures if conjugal concupiscence is not his creation. Take this law away, which you say is the law of sin, and let us see who could still have sex [blamelessly] with their spouse! But he who gave virtue in the blessing of the seed is the same one who introduced love for the sake of multiplication of the offspring of concupiscence, and who wanted what he ordered to multiply and to be loved as well. But if in concupiscence, as you say, lies every cause of sin, God himself is responsible for starting a crime in humankind, since he wanted posterity to be reproduced through love and ordered man that the wife should be loved above the rights of his parents’ love. Finally, when our Lord Jesus Christ says: *What God has joined together, no human being must separate*,<sup>175</sup> it is as if he said: “You are not allowed to hate your wife whom you began to love because I arranged this to be so.” Thus, [allegedly] he was concerned that the union created by him was going to be polluted by conjugal strife.

What an original distortion [of the meaning of the biblical text]! When the hatred for one’s wife is punished by God, the concupiscence of husbands is instead condemned by people. But the righteous judge does not condemn natural desire since, in order to multiply the descendants he introduced love. Now, in matters of repudiation and marriage the Lord Jesus prescribed this rule, saying: *What God has joined together, no human being must separate*. He said this in order to show that conjugal union originates from God. Nor could it be either a mixture without union,

---

<sup>175</sup> Mt 19:6.

benedictione coniunxit quod diabolus per prauearicationem inseruit. Quod si ita est, non fuit aduersarius, sed adiutor dei. Si quos deus in carne una esse uoluit, hic per concupiscentiam inseparabiles fecit, et quod ille iussit augeri et crescere, hic per quod hoc ipsum quod iusserat ut impleretur inuenit.

O quam infelix impietas est a Praedestinatis inuenta, ut ex prauearicatione dicatur euenissem homini, quod est ex benedictione creatoris insertum! Hanc uos dicitis legem peccati, sed hanc nos legem generis comprobamus quam uos criminis accusatis, et hanc nos dicimus causam esse uirtutum quam uos uultis ostendere materiam uitiorum. Nam cum eius adiutorium faciat parentes fecundos in sobole, huius certamen et continentes praestat et uirgines gloriosos. Et ne alicubi huius esse aestimes detrimentum, maiora repugnando quam adiuuando largitur, quia dum adiuuat, fructum exhibit generis, dum repugnat, confert praemium castitatis. Illic sine culpa operatur, hic exercet pugnam cum munere. Tolle concupiscentiam, et cessant coniugia. Tolle concupiscentiam, et cessant praemia castitatis. Quale hoc, rogo, malum est, quod duplicitis boni causa esse monstratur, quod alios in generationis gaudio exhibit, alios in triumpho uirtutis? Alii enim per eam operantur licite, alii per eam dimicant gloriose. Quod si etiam in omnibus haec dicitur esse peccatum, constat et coniuges et continentes et uirgines per hanc esse damnandos. Omnibus enim inesse cognoscitur per naturam. Nos non ita esse sentimus, sed laudamus eam ordinem suum custodientem et deo reuerentiam exhibentem. Et ideo in baptizatis etiam ipsa benedicitur, non fugatur, et ornatur magis quam tollitur. Qui enim fontem aquae perennis nunc benedixit ut renasceremur spiritualiter, ipse tunc benedixit coniuges ut carnaliter nasceremur. Hunc ergo concupiscentiae motum, sicut cetera alia membra, a creatore suscepimus. Si ideo est concupiscentia malum quia per hanc aliquoties adulterium geritur, ergo et manus mala est, quia per hanc homicidium perpetratur. Accusate et linguam, quia per ipsam blasphematur deus, damnate et pedes, quod hominem duxerint ad lupanar. Sic fit ut non sola concupiscentia, sed uniuersa a uobis membra damnentur.

Respondeam uobis ore catholico, quoniam sicut manus facta est non ad occidendum, sed ad operandum, et lingua non ad blasphemandum, sed ad gloriam creatoris et laudem, et membra omnia non ut uitiis seruant, sed diuinis praceptis insistant, ita et concupiscentia naturae est insita non ad adulterandum, sed ad generandum, quam utique comprobauius non modo coniugibus fecunditatis adiutorium, sed etiam continentibus palmam posse afferre uirtutis. Vultis nosse bonam hanc esse concupiscentiam? Mysteriis eam comparabo diuinis. Non enim solum appetita mala, sed etiam bona praesumpta condemnant. Pone aliquem

or a union without mixture. But if marital desire does not come from God's creature but from sin, as they say, it then follows that, according to you, God conjoined in this blessing what the devil introduced through a human being's transgression. For if this is how things are, the devil was not God's enemy, but rather his helper, if indeed God, through concupiscence, made inseparable those whom he wanted to be in one flesh.

O what a miserable blasphemy has been invented by the Predestinarians! According to them, what has been introduced by the Creator's blessing turns out to be a human transgression instead! You say that this is the law of sin; but we confirm it to be the law of the human species, which you regard instead as a serious crime. However, we say that the cause of virtues is what you intend to point out as an occasion for sins, instead. Now, when its help makes parents fruitful with children, its struggles produce continent people and glorious virgins. And so that you may not think that this represents a loss, more grace is given by fighting concupiscence than by giving into it, since when people give into it they reveal the [natural] outcome of sex, though when they oppose it, they obtain the reward of chastity. In the first case they operate without guilt; in the latter case, they fight against a gift. Take away concupiscence and there will no longer be married couples, and the rewards of chastity will end as well. What kind of evil is it, I ask, if it is shown to be the cause of a double good? If it shows some people in the joy of generation and others in the triumph of virtue? Some people work in an acceptable manner through it, others fight through it in a glorious manner. For if this too is said to be sin in all things, it then follows that married couples, continent people and virgins are to be damned through it; for it is known that concupiscence is found in everybody through nature. However, we do not think like you do, but rather praise concupiscence which maintains God's order and shows reverence for him! Thus, let concupiscence be blessed and not spurned in the baptized, and be respected rather than removed! For he who blessed the source of perennial water, so that we may be spiritually reborn, also blessed married couples so that we may be born in the flesh. Therefore, we receive from the Creator this impulse of concupiscence just like all other members of our body. And so, if concupiscence is a bad thing because sometimes adultery is perpetrated through it, then we may as well say that the hand is also a bad thing because through it homicides are committed. Go ahead and blame the tongue, because through it God is blasphemed. Curse the foot then, because it leads a man to the brothel. By the same logic then, not only concupiscence but every single member in the body ends up condemned by you.

Let me reply to you from a Catholic perspective that a hand was not made to kill, but to work; the tongue was not made to blaspheme, but to sing the praise and glory of the Creator; and all the members of the body were not made to become instruments of vice, but that they may abide by divine precepts. Therefore, concupiscence was introduced in nature not in order to commit adultery, but for the sake of procreating. Thus, we have proven that concupiscence not only contributes to couples the help of fertility, but that it also bestows the crown of virtue to those who practice continence. Do you refuse to acknowledge that this concupiscence is good? As far as I am concerned, I will compare it instead to the divine mysteries. These people condemn not only bad things that are yearned for but also things that are assumed to be good. Assume that someone has partaken of the body of the Lord before [receiving] the illumination of

ante baptismatis illuminationem corpus domini praesumpsisse: numquid non iste de boni praesumptione damnabitur? Quod enim aliis collatum secundum ordinem confert salutem, hoc aliis damnationem facit extra ordinem et extra tempus acceptum. Similiter si usurpet laicus sacerdotium, uel si sacrificium offerre praesumat, numquid non de non concessa sibi potestate damnandus est? Quod si de tam sanctis rebus praesumptio reum facit, non actio, quanto magis in concupiscentia, non actio suum ordinem tenens, sed extra ordinem uadens, uocatur in crimen, et facit maledictum extra ordinem euntem, quem benedictum creator in suo ordine collocauit? Quod si ita est, immo quia ita est, quid patimini, infelices, qui uolentes exinanire baptismatis restorationem, dicitis hanc concupiscentiam ideo remansisse, ne tota ex amussim homini peccata uiderentur indulta? Cur non magis hinc uobis debuit esse suspicio, hanc non esse peccatum, quod in baptizatis hominibus non deletur? Si enim esset peccatum, utique sicut cetera tolleretur.

Igitur qui per concupiscentiam baptismatis dona exinanire contenditis, conditorem concupiscentiae diabolum esse monstratis, per quem docetis et creatorem in sua operatione dum conderet defecisse, et baptismum tribuentem ex integro non potuisse succurrere. Habebunt uobis cum partem qui uos ad se libenter admittunt. Scriptum est enim reos fore, non solum qui iniuriam faciunt, sed etiam eos quos eis constiterit consensisse

baptism. Wouldn't this person be condemned for partaking too early of something that is good? That which is given to some people at the right time brings salvation to some, but if it is received outside the right time and order, it procures the damnation of others. In the same way, if a lay person impersonates a priest or if he presumes to offer the eucharistic sacrifice, wouldn't this person deserve to be damned because he usurped this power which was never granted him? For if the presumption and not the action *per se* made a person guilty of using such sacred things, how much more in concupiscence not the action that follows its right course, but the one that is out of sequence is called a sin and damns one who goes out of the order which the Creator blessed according to his own arrangement! For if this is how it is, and indeed it is so, why do you suffer, o miserable ones? You want to empty the renewal of baptism and go on to say that this concupiscence remained in us so that all human sins may not appear to be entirely forgiven? Why should you not rather suspect that this is not a sin, considering that it is not erased in baptized people? For if it was a sin, it would be totally removed like all other things.

Therefore, you who strive to empty the gifts of baptism through concupiscence, you show that the creator of concupiscence is the devil. You teach that because of the devil the Creator failed in his operation as he was creating and that he was not able to offer new help by conferring baptism. Those who gladly admit you in their company will share your fate! It is written that not only those who commit iniquities, but also those who agree with them will be found guilty in the end. (q)



# Further Notes

## Headings

a. These lists of headings, *capitula*, for *Praedestinatus* 1 and 3 are only found in a single manuscript where they are found with the note ‘written by the monk Reginbert’ (see CCSL 25B,3) but they are included here because such *capitula* lists as an inherent part of the transmission of texts (e.g. the gospels) in manuscript. While they are usually later than the time of the work’s composition they do indicate the value later generations placed upon texts, how they understood them, and read them. They are an incidental indication of the text’s utility and a demonstration that the text has played a complex role in the history in Latin theology.

## First Book

- a. Philastrius, bishop of Brescia (d. before AD 397) and author of *Diversarum hereseon liber*.
- b. In that passage we read that Nicholas of Antioch was a convert to Judaism. All biblical quotes in this translation are taken from the New American Bible Revised Edition except otherwise noted.
- c. See Gal 5:5–6.
- d. This person is mentioned in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* V, 13.
- e. NKJV translation.
- f. In Gori’s edition this is given as a quotation but not put in italics; it is, in fact, a mixture of paraphrase and quotation from 1 Cor 13:3.
- g. Augustine, in *De haeresibus* 43, says that Epiphanius identified this second “Origen” with Adamantius, writer of theological works.
- h. *Mattarii*, or “those who sleep on mats.”
- i. Melitius or Meletius, of Lycopolis, Egypt, died in 307. He was responsible for a schism brought about by his refusal to welcome back repented Christians who had lapsed during the Diocletian persecution. His followers are reputed to have subsequently joined ranks with the Arians. He is not to be confused with Meletius of Antioch (d. 381), a fierce Nicaea loyalist and anti-Arian.
- j. Ps 18:6 in the Vulgate, and 18:5 in the LXX. Most English translations give a different meaning: “God has placed a tent *for the sun* in the heavens.” NABRE translates Ps 19:5 as “He has pitched in them a tent *for the sun*.”
- k. The Seleucians did not practice water baptism because they took John the Baptist’s words literally: “He will baptize you with the holy Spirit and fire” (Mt 3:11).

- l. I was unable to find the corresponding biblical reference.
- m. Quoted by Jesus in Lk 23:46.
- n. We cannot help but notice the irony conveyed in this statement.
- o. In AD 394 at the Council of Bagai (located in modern day Algeria) Maximian's episcopal ordination was overturned, and Primian was appointed Primate of Africa.
- p. Phrase of obscure meaning.
- q. In this sentence Arnobius reverses the order found in Augustine's *De haeresibus*. Augustine said that as they avoid eating meat, disagreements arose between husbands and wives over this issue.
- r. See 1 Pt 3:19.
- s. Actually, Ambrose summoned a synod in Milan to have him condemned and wrote a letter to the Pope (*Epistle 42*) about its proceedings. It was Jerome who wrote *Contra Iovinianum* in two books.
- t. See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* VI, 37.
- u. Aurelius (d. 429) was bishop of Carthage from 391 up to his death.
- v. This belief concerning the origin of the soul is known as "traducianism."
- w. The Vulgate translated the phrase *εν ω* (found in the Greek manuscript available to him) as *in quo* which is translated in English as "*in whom*"). The critical edition of the text since Erasmus prefers the lesson *εφ'ω* (translated in English as "*insofar as*").

## Second Book

- a. In Arnobius' biblical quote the order of the terms is reversed. In the Vulgate we read: *Quos autem praedestinavit, hos et vocavit*. NABRE reads: *And those he predestined he also called*.
- b. The other scriptural passage in which Judas' death is mentioned is Mt 27:3-10. In the Matthean account Judas hangs himself. Acts 1:18 mentions a sudden death by evisceration like that of many common criminals in popular traditions.
- c. The Latin text uses the term *lectio divina*, the monastic way of reading/praying scriptures at various times of the day. These activities suggest that the author was familiar with or living in a monastic community.
- d. The author is referring to Paul's conversion from persecutor of Christians to passionate follower of Christ. See Acts 9:1-23; 22:1-21. This expression is also found in other works attributed to Arnobius.
- e. The second half of the verse is found in the Latin Vulgate, but not in NABRE.

## Third Book

- a. Cyprian, *De zelo et labore*, 2. See also Murphy (2018).
- b. The Vulgate has: *Nolite aspicere nobis ea quae recta sunt*. NABRE's translation reads: "Do not prophesy truth for us."

- c. My thanks to Francis Gumerlock who made possible the translation of this obscure passage.
- d. I was unable to find this quote in the Petrine letters.
- e. Gen 22:18: “In your descendants all the nations of the earth will find blessing,” is the translation of the Vulgate’s version: *et benedicentur in semine tuo omnes gentes terrae*. Arnobius’ version artificially changes the verb: *in semine tuo hereditabo omnes gentes*, (In your seed I will inherit all peoples), thus providing a hermeneutical tool with which he put forward his understanding of predestination.
- f. Paraphrase of Rom 11:32.
- g. Jesus himself.
- h. The second half of this verse quoted by Arnobius is not found in the Vulgate.
- i. The Vulgate after *in Christo Jesu* adds *qui non secundum carnem ambulant* (“who do not walk according to the flesh”). This second half of this verse is no longer found in the critical editions and translations of the New Testament.
- j. The Vulgate has “*me*” instead of “*vos*.”
- k. This phrase is not found in the Vulgate.
- l. The Vulgate has: *ex voluntate mea confitebor ei*, which translates the LXX version: “καὶ εκ θελήματος μου εξομολογήσομαι αὐτῷ.”
- m. The Vulgate has: *Voluntarie sacrificabo tibi*, which translates the LXX version: “εκουσίως θύσω σοι.”
- n. Lk 7:47. The text reads: *So I tell you, her many sins have been forgiven; hence, she has shown great love. But the one to whom little is forgiven, loves little.*
- o. Arnobius followed the Vulgate’s version of Gen 49:5,6: *in furore suo occiderunt virum, et in voluntate sua suffoderunt murum*. NABRE translated that as: “For in their fury they killed men, at their whim they maimed oxen.”
- p. 1 Tim 6: 10: *For the love of money is the root of all evils, and some people in their desire for it have strayed from the faith and have pierced themselves with many pains.*
- q. Rom 1:32: *Although they know the just decree of God that all who practice such things deserve death, they not only do them but give approval to those who practice them.*



# Bibliography

## Ancient and Medieval Authors

Arnobius iunior, *Commentarii in psalmos* (CCSL 25).

Augustine, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* (PL 44, 881–912 [Teske, R. (1999) *Answers to the Pelagians* IV, Hyde Park, NY]).

— *De correptione et gratia* (PL 44, 915–958 [Teske, R. (1999) *Answers to the Pelagians* IV, Hyde Park, NY]).

— *De praedestinatione sanctorum* (PL 44, 959–992 [Teske, R. (1999) *Answers to the Pelagians* IV, Hyde Park, NY]).

— *De dono perseverantiae* (PL 45, 993–1048 [Teske, R. (1999) *Answers to the Pelagians* IV, Hyde Park, NY]).

— *De haeresibus* (CCSL 46, 283–345 [Teske, R. (1995), *Arianism and Other Heresies*, Hyde Park, NY]).

— *De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus liber unus* (CCSL 44A [Ramsey, B. (2008) *Responses to Miscellaneous Questions*, Hyde Park, NY]).

— *Enarrationes in psalmos* CCSL 38–40.

Gennadius, *De viris illustribus* (Czapla, B. (1898), Munster).

Hincmar, *De praedestinatione dei et libero arbitrio posterior dissertatio* (PL 125, 65–472).

Prosper of Aquitaine, *De vocatione omnium gentium* (PL 51, 647–722 [De Letter, P. (1952) *The Call of All Nations*, Ramsey, NJ]).

— *Carmen de ingratis* (Huegelmeyer, C.T. (1962), Washington, DC).

— *De gratia Dei et libero arbitrio contra Collatorem* (PL 51, 25–76 [De Letter, P. (1962) *Against the Lecturer*, Ramsey, NJ]).

— *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Gallorum calumniantium* (PL 51, 155–74 [De Letter, P. (1962) *Answers to the Objections of the Gauls*, Ramsey, NJ]).

— *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Vincentianarum* (PL 51, 177–86 [De Letter, P. (1962) *Answers to the Vincentian Articles*, Ramsey, NJ]).

— *Chronicum alterum sive Pseudochronicum* (PL 51, 535–607).

Pseudo-Jerome, *Indiculus de haeresibus* (PL 81, 636–44).

## Modern Authors

Alberti, A. (1996) *Prospero d'Aquitania. Teologo e discepolo*, Brescia.

Amann, E. (1935a) “Praedestinatus,” *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 12, 2775–80.

— (1935b) “Predestinarianisme,” *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 12, 2803–09.

Auvray, M. (1644) *Censure d'une livre que le R.P. J. Sirmond a fait imprimer sur un vieil manuscript et qu'il a intitulé 'Praedestinatus*, Paris.

Backus, I. and Goudriaan, A. (2014) “Semipelagianism:’ The Origins of the Term and Its Passage into the History of Heresy,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 65, 25–46.

Bardy, G. (1929) “L’indiculus de haeresibus du pseudo-Jerome,” *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 19, 385–405.

Bowman, D. (2002) *The Divine Decision: A Process Doctrine of Election*, Louisville, KY.

Denzinger, H. (2012) *Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals*, San Francisco, CA.

Gori, F. (1999) *Il Praedestinatus di Arnobio il Giovane: l’eresiologia contro l’Agostinismo*, Rome.

— (2000) *Arnobii iunioris Praedestinatus qui dicitur*, Turnhout.

Gumerlock, F. (2010) *Gottschalk and A Medieval Predestination Controversy*, Milwaukee, WI.

— (2013) “Arnobius the Younger against the ‘Predestined One:’ Was Prosper of Aquitaine the Predestinarian Opponent of Arnobius the Younger?” *Augustinian Studies* 44(2), 249–63.

Halverson, J. (1998) *Peter Aureol on Predestination: A Challenge to Late Medieval Thought*, Leiden.

Harden Weaver, R. (1996) *Divine Grace and Human Agency. A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy*, Macon, GA.

Hwang, A. (2009) *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace: The Life and Thought of Prosper of Aquitaine*, Washington, DC.

Jacquin, M. (1907) “A quelle date apparait le term ‘Semipelagien?’” *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Theologiques* 1, 506–08.

James, N. W. (2018) “Who Was Arnobius the Younger? Dissimulation, Deception and Disguise by a Fifth Century Opponent of Augustine,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 69, 243–61.

Jansenius, C. (1640) *Augustinus*, Louvain.

Klein, W. (2015) *The New Chosen People, Revised and Expanded Edition: A Corporate View of Election*, Eugene, OR.

Lettieri, G. (2001) *L’altro Agostino: ermeneutica e retorica della grazia dalla crisi alla metamorfosi del De doctrina christiana*, Brescia.

McClure, J. (1979) “Handbooks Against Heresy in the West. From the Late Fourth to the Late Sixth Centuries,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 30, 186–97.

Morin, G. (1909) “Examen des écrits attribués à Arnobe le Jeune,” *Revue Bénédictine* 26, 419–32.

— (1911) “Etude d’ensemble sur Arnobe le Jeune,” *Revue Bénédictine* 28, 154–90.

— (1936) “L’origine africaine d’Arnobe le Jeune,” *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 16, 177–84.

Sadowski, S. (2015) “A Critical Look and Evaluation of Augustine’s *De Haeresibus*,” *Augustinianum* 55, 461–78.

Shank, R. (1970) *Elect in the Son: A Study of the Doctrine of Election*, Ada, OK.

Sirmond, J. (1643) *Praedestinatus. Praedestinatorum haeresis et libri S. Augustino temere adscripti refutatio*, Paris.

— (1648) *Historia praedestinatiana quibus initis exorta et per quos potissimum profligata  
praedestinatorum haeresis olim fuerit et oppressa*, Paris.

Stucco, G. (2006) *Not without Us: A Brief History of the Forgotten Catholic Doctrine of  
Predestination during the Semipelagian Controversy*, Tucson, AZ.

— (2008) *The Colors of Grace: Medieval Kaleidoscopic Views of Grace and Predestination*,  
Bloomington, IN.

— (2017) *The Doctrine of Predestination in Catholic Scholasticism*, Scotts Valley, CA.

Van Geest, P. (2020) “Augustine’s Approach to Heresies as an Aid to Understanding His  
Idea on Interaction between Christian Traditions” in M. Fredericks and D. Nagy eds,  
*World Christianity: Methodological Considerations*, Leiden, 251–70.

Von Schubert, H. (1903) *Der sogennante Praedestinatus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des  
Pelagianismus*, Leipzig.



# Index of Biblical Texts

<b>Gen</b>			
1:28	233	103:4	187
5:32	24	103 (104): 14-15	79
7:6	24	114:4	191
14:18-20	83	116:11	137
25:23	25, 157	119:1	145
		126:1	29, 57, 135
<b>Ex</b>		127:2	193
3:5	107	145:6	69
20:11	69		
<b>Lev</b>		<b>Prov</b>	
26	107	1:25-26	149
		<b>Wis</b>	
<b>2 Kgs</b>		3:1	103
17	131	8:2	211
<b>2 Chr</b>			
19:7	27	<b>Sir</b>	
		15:8	137
<b>Neh</b>		<b>Is</b>	
9:6	69	1:19-20	189
<b>Job</b>		1:19-21	149
34:19	27	5:20	75
<b>Ps</b>		20:2	107
8:4	99	30:10	147
14:3	137	47:5	107
19:4	101	65:17	107
22:23	161	<b>Jer</b>	
28:7	201	10:23	55, 131
31:6	103	17:5	11
36:4	223	29:5	191
49:2	161	51:48	69
49:2-3	159	<b>Ez</b>	
53:8	179, 201	11:19	41
72:23-24	187	18	25
73:12	229	33	25
73:27	187	33:11	155, 205
82:1	99	33:13-15	
91:1	217	33:14	155
91:5-6	217	33:14-15	131
91:14	217	<b>Mal</b>	

1:2-3	155	12:35	189
1:6	209	14:15	223
<b>2 Mac</b>		14:21	223
7:28	69	14:28	185
<b>Mt</b>		15:16	16
3:2	181	16:24	219
4:17	181	17:24	185
5:17	79	<b>Act</b>	
5:28	221	1:18	169
7:8	207, 219	3:25	161
7:7-8	40, 159, 181	4:24	69
7:9-11	207	5:28	161
7:23	175	5:29	189
7:24	191	6:1-6	67
9:17	105	8:23	133
10:37	211	8:37	183
11:28	35, 159, 177	9:2	173
12:29	215	9:4	175
13:27-28	87	9:5	175
16:24	69	10:34	163
19:4-5	233	14:14	69
19:6	233, 235	26:10-11 133	
19:12	85	<b>Rom</b>	
20:16	14	1:32	31
22:14	14	2:11	27, 163
22:30	141	3:19	159
23:37	149	3:23	57, 163
25:13	193	3:24	163
26:38	113	5:10-11	213
28:19	203	5:10	57, 137
28:19-20	26	5:12	123
<b>Lk</b>		6:19	223
1:35	71	6:20-22	201
2:14	127	7:14-25	39
5:38	105	7:14	197, 199
12:43	193	7:15	199
15:7	97	7:18	199
23:34	27	7:18-19	199
<b>Jn</b>		7:19	57, 135, 195
1:5	159	7:22	199
1:47	137	7:24-25	199
6:44	39, 40, 57, 127	7:25	201
6:64	27, 135	8:1	201
6:65	15	8:2	201
12:6	169	8:18	229

8:24	30, 59, 127, 139, 229	15:50	125
8:29-30	55	<b>2 Cor</b>	
8:29	27, 161	3:5	41
8:30	16, 55, 131, 167	3:17	221
8:31	161	5:10	159
8:32	27, 161	5:14-15	215
8:33-34	77	9:6	223
9:10-13	25	9:7	223
9:11	131	11:7	199
9:12	40, 157	15:54-56	141
9:13	55, 131, 155	15:57	127, 141
9:16	55, 57, 135, 187, 189	<b>Gal</b>	
9:16-18	129	1:8	157
9:18	55	1:13-14	171
9:19-24	16	1:13	133
9:21	55, 129	2:6	27
9:22	25, 55, 131, 155	2:20	197
10:10	105, 209	4:10	30
10:12	159	5:17	55, 129
10:13	217	6:1	197
11:32	157	6:7	177
11:33	14, 16	<b>Eph</b>	
12:3	159	1:4	16
14:3	81	1:5	16
<b>1 Cor</b>		2:3	229
1:23	163	2:5-8	189
3:1	197	5:11	177
3:3	197	6:4	27
3:6	15	6:9	163
3:10	191	<b>Phil</b>	
3:12-13	191	2:7	103
4:4	177	2:8	115
4:7	15, 187	2:13	41
4:11	229	3:14	175
4:15	211	<b>Col</b>	
9:17	175	1:28	159
9:22	157	3:25	27
9:24	189	<b>1 Thes</b>	
9:26	175	2:13	15
9:27	177	2:16	161
10:12	17	5:11	191
13:2	115	<b>1 Tim</b>	
14:15	105	1:13	30, 173
15:10	189	2:4	14, 41
15:45-49	123	2:3-4	159

4:3-5	79	4:7	215
6:10	169	<b>1 Pet</b>	
6:11	12	3:12	99
<b>2 Tim</b>		3:20	24, 147
2:19	175	3:21	30
2:20	25	5:8	169, 177
2:20-21	155	<b>2 Pet</b>	
2:22	12	2:1	33
3:7	169	<b>1 Jn</b>	
3:17	159	2:19	14
4:7	189	3:2	229
<b>Tit</b>		4:10	16
2:11	27, 159	<b>Jude</b>	
<b>Heb</b>		24	13
7:3	85	<b>Apoc</b>	
<b>Jas</b>		1:20	73
1:17	189		

# Index of Ancient and Medieval Names

Abel 29, 55, 119, 191, 193, 219  
Abraham 39, 75, 159, 161, 173, 191, 219  
Abrasax 67  
Adam 31, 41, 45, 51, 73, 75, 83, 95, 119, 121, 123, 127, 139, 183, 225, 227  
Aerianus 53, 99  
Aetius 53, 99  
Africanus 67, 117  
Alexander (bishop) 73  
Ambrose 10, 117  
Ammonius (presbyter) 99  
Ampullianus 87  
Anastasius I (pope) 117  
Apelles 23, 51, 77  
Aphrodisius (bishop) 97  
Apollinaris 53, 99, 101  
Apollonius (bishop) 77, 81, 119  
Apollos 15  
Arbogast 119  
Arius 53, 97, 185, 197  
Arnobius Iunior 7, 8, 9, 10, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 39, 42, 44, 46  
Arnobius of Sicca 7  
Artemon 89  
Augustine of Hippo 7, *passim*  
Aurelius (bishop) 119  
Bardaisan 51, 85  
Barnabas (apostle) 69  
Basil (bishop) 97  
Basilides 51, 67  
Caecilianus (bishop) 107, 109, 111  
Caelestius 27, 121, 123, 225  
Cain 51, 75, 171, 173  
Carpocrates 51, 69  
Cassian 24, 35  
Celestine (pope) 9, 10, 32, 33, 34, 35, 42, 44, 63, 125  
Cerdo 51, 77  
Cerinthus 51, 69  
Clement (pope) 65, 71  
Colluthus 53, 105  
Colorbasius 51, 73  
Constantius 47, 121  
Crato (bishop) 83  
Cyprian 8, 12, 17, 46, 85, 143  
Cyril (bishop) 125  
Damasus (pope) 117  
David 71, 127, 191  
Diocletian 7  
Diodorus (bishop) 71, 101  
Dionysius (bishop) 85  
Dioscurus (bishop) 75  
Donatus 8, 53, 89, 107, 109, 111  
Dositheus (bishop) 87  
Elcesa 83  
Elijah 39, 171, 173, 175  
Elvidius 55, 117  
Ennodius (bishop) 47  
Enoch 29, 219  
Ephrem (presbyter) 101  
Epiphanius 23, 67, 75, 79, 81, 83, 85, 87, 97, 99, 101, 117  
Eunomius 31, 53, 99  
Euphranus (bishop) 79  
Eusebius 75, 117  
Eustachius (bishop) 73  
Evander (bishop) 73  
Eve 95  
Ezekiel (prophet) 25, 131  
Faustus of Riez 33, 39, 40, 42, 46  
Flodoard 33, 42  
Florianus 53, 107  
Florus 37  
Fulgentius (saint) 33, 37, 42

Gelasius (pope) 47  
 Gennadius 8, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 43, 45, 46  
 Genseric (king of Vandals) 45  
 Gerard Odonis 15  
 Goliath 63, 127  
 Gottschalk of Orbais 32, 33, 37, 44, 47  
 Gregory (bishop) 32, 111, 113  
 Gregory I (pope) 32  
 Hadrian I (pope) 32  
 Heracleon 51, 73  
 Heraclianus (count) 109  
 Hermogenes 87  
 Hesiod 67, 97, 117  
 Hesperius 119  
 Hieracha 53, 97  
 Hilary 14, 15, 34, 44  
 Hincmar 5, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47  
 Honorius of Autun 15  
 Hormisdas (pope) 47  
 Hyginus 23, 32, 67  
 Innocent I (pope) 121  
 Isaac 25, 39, 75, 173, 191, 219  
 Isaiah 107  
 Isidore of Seville 32, 34, 43, 46  
 Israel 75, 149, 173  
 Jacob 25, 55, 75, 131, 155, 173, 191, 219, 223  
 Japhet 219  
 Jerome 31, 117, 121  
 Jesus (son of Nave) 191  
 Johannes 191  
 John the Baptist 193  
 John (apostle) 27, 67, 69, 83  
 John (bishop) 83  
 Jonah 75  
 Joseph (patriarch) 75, 191  
 Joseph (Jesus' father) 101, 117  
 Jovinianus 53, 115, 117  
 Judas (apostle) 55, 75, 89, 107, 133, 167, 169, 171  
 Julian of Eclanum 8, 27, 39, 41, 42  
 Leo I (pope) 18  
 Leontium (bishop) 46  
 Levi 223  
 Linus (pope) 67  
 Lucidus 33, 46  
 Lucifer 53, 115  
 Luke (evangelist) 71  
 Macedonius 53, 99  
 Majorinus (bishop) 109  
 Mani 23, 41, 46, 53, 89, 91, 93, 95, 111, 165  
 Marcellina 69  
 Marcion 23, 51, 75, 77  
 Marcus 51, 71  
 Martinian 8, 119  
 Mary (mother of Jesus) 71, 89, 101, 117, 125  
 Maximian 109  
 Maximilla 81, 119  
 Maximus 119  
 Meletius 53, 97  
 Melkisedek 51, 83, 219  
 Menander 51, 67  
 Monimus 33  
 Montanus 81, 119  
 Moses 29, 67, 69, 77, 95, 107, 115, 191  
 Nazareo 51  
 Nathaniel 137, 215  
 Nestorius 31, 32, 55, 125  
 Nicholas (heretic) 51, 67  
 Nicholas I (pope) 33, 34, 37, 44  
 Noah 24, 29, 147, 191, 219  
 Novatus 85  
 Octaviana 119  
 Optatus (bishop) 89, 105  
 Origen (heretic) 53, 87  
 Origen 40, 77, 87, 89, 117  
 Pamphilus (martyr) 77, 89  
 Papias (presbyter) 83  
 Parmenianus 89  
 Patricius 53, 103  
 Paul (apostle) 14, 15, 16, 25, 30, 39, 40, 55, 57, 69, 71, 77, 79, 81, 113, 123, 127, 133, 157, 159, 161, 163, 171, 173, 175, 177, 191, 195, 199, 201, 203, 211, 213, 223  
 Paul of Samosata 53, 89  
 Paulinus (deacon) 121  
 Pelagius 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 24, 27, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 46, 47, 53, 57, 119, 121, 123, 137, 219, 225

Perigenes (presbyter) 75  
 Peter (apostle) 24, 65, 67, 147, 159, 163,  
 177, 189  
 Peter Aureol 15  
 Philastrius 23, 67, 99, 101, 111  
 Philo (bishop) 83  
 Photinus 53, 89  
 Photius (patriarch) 44  
 Plato 11  
 Polycarp (bishop) 83  
 Polycrates 23, 67, 117  
 Praxeas 87  
 Primian 109  
 Prisca 81, 119  
 Priscilla 81  
 Priscillianus 53, 111  
 Processus 8, 119  
 Proclinus 53, 103  
 Prosper (author) 45, 46  
 Prosper of Aquitaine 5, 10, 14, 15, 18, 19,  
 20, 21, 22, 24, 33, 34, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42,  
 44, 45, 47  
 Pseudo-Jerome 31, 35  
 Ptolemy 51, 71  
 Pythagoras 69, 105  
 Quintilla 81  
 Quodvultdeus 23  
 Rabanus Maurus 47  
 Rebecca 157  
 Remigius (archbishop of Lyons) 37  
 Rhetorius 53, 111  
 Rufinus 19  
 Sabellius 51, 87, 111  
 Sabinianus (presbyter) 73  
 Saclas 95  
 Satan 69, 79  
 Satannius 53, 107  
 Saturninus 51, 69  
 Saul 55, 133, 167  
 Seleucus 53, 101  
 Sem 219  
 Serapion 9  
 Seth 51, 75  
 Severus 51, 79  
 Sigebert of Gembloux 33, 34, 35, 42  
 Simeon 223  
 Simon Magus 51, 65, 67, 127  
 Simplicianus 10  
 Siricius (pope) 117  
 Sixtus II (pope and martyr) 85  
 Sixtus III (pope) 10, 44  
 Solomon 191, 209  
 Soter (pope) 81, 119  
 Susannah 75, 169  
 Syrinus 75  
 Tatian 51, 79  
 Tertullian 8, 40, 55, 77, 81, 103, 119  
 Theocritus (bishop) 73, 85  
 Theodorus (bishop) 73, 75, 107  
 Theodosius II (Emperor) 32, 45, 119  
 Theodotian (heretic) 51, 83  
 Theodotus (bishop) 73, 101  
 Theophilus Apameus (bishop) 85  
 Thomas (apostle) 69  
 Thomas of Strasburg 15  
 Timothy 79, 173, 175  
 Tranquillus (bishop) 85  
 Tyconius 8  
 Ursus (tribune) 93  
 Valens (Emperor) 45  
 Valentinian III (Emperor) 32, 117  
 Valentinus (abbot of Hadrumetum) 11,  
 12, 13  
 Valentinus (heretic) 51, 71, 85  
 Vitalis 11  
 Wandon 8  
 William of Champeaux 15  
 William of Ockham 15  
 Zaccheus (bishop) 71  
 Zachary 193  
 Zeno (bishop) 99

## Index of Modern Authors

Amann, E. 10, 23, 38  
Auvray (Barcos' pseudonym) 5, 38, 42, 43  
Backus, I. 18  
Barcos, M. 5, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43  
Bardy, G. 31  
Baronius 38  
Bowman, D. 25  
Cappuyns, M. 23  
De Letter, P. 18, 19  
Denzinger, H. 37  
Driedo 46  
Elberti, A. 19  
Erasmus of Rotterdam 9  
Gori, F. 7, 8, 9, 10, 23, 27, 30  
Goudriaan, A. 18  
Gumerlock, F. 24, 32  
Hadrian VI (pope) 9  
Halverson, J. 15  
Harden Weaver, R. 11  
Huegelmeyer, C. 19, 20  
Hwang, A. 19  
James, N. 8  
Jansenius (bishop) 5, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 43, 45, 46, 47  
Klein, W. 25  
Lettieri, G. 10, 11  
Lewis, C.S. 26  
Migne, J.-P. 7  
Molina, L. 38  
Morin, G. 8, 9, 23  
Oiselius, J. 45  
Pithoeus, P. 45  
Sadowski, S. 23  
Shank, R. 25  
Sirmond, J. 5, 7, 9, 22, 23, 38, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47  
Stucco, G. 11, 15, 32, 37  
Suarez, F. 38  
Tapper, R. 46  
Teske, R. 12, 23, 44  
Van Geest, P. 23  
Vergier du Hauranne, J. 38  
Von Schubert, H. 8, 9, 23  
Wilmart, A. 9